THE EXPOSITORY TIMES

Notes of Recent Exposition

THE question of the relation of the Scriptures to the developing tradition of the Church has constituted one of the major problems of Christian history. Each has played an important part in guiding Christian thought and practice, and each must make a contribution to the life of the ecumenical Church to-day. But how far and in what ways is each to be followed? Is one more important than the other? Is one determinative and the other subsidiary? No small part of the difficulty of ecumenical relations, not to mention reunion, arises from the fact that Christians give varying answers to these questions, and that is so because the problem of Scripture and Tradition is part of the wider problem of the nature of the Church itself.

The Catholic sees the Church as the Body of Christ mediating the Divine life of Christ to men through organs of continuity, ministerial and sacramental, which are of Divine ordinance. From this point of view the Scriptures are little more than a by-product of the Church's life. They have authoritative weight, but not supreme authority, for Tradition is independent of and indeed interpretative of Holy Scripture. On the other hand, for many Protestants the Church, nourished by the Word and the gospel sacraments, is set under the authority of the Word, and the Word is mediated to the Church by the intransmissible ministry of the apostles. The Scriptures are not simply historical sources: they are authoritative because the apostles were unique instruments of the Divine revelation in Christ. From this point of view Scripture is normative: and ecclesiastical tradition is subject to perpetual criticism by the Word. In this connexion one may recall that in recent times some who may be called theologians of the Word have shown a willingness to reconsider long-established practice in their own communions and to suggest abandoning infant baptism for believers' baptism on the ground of their Scriptural insights.

The Church, however, does not exist in a vacuum. It is set in the world, in the stream of history; and it is a Biblical conviction that God is Lord of history, accomplishing His purposes outside as well as within the Church. That being so, must we not take both the order of Nature and the process of history quite seriously? Were the changes in the Church between the first and fourth centuries simply a matter of the Church being invaded and degraded by the world, or was the Church's implication in the culture which it could now influence from within as well as without the inevitable fruit of its faithfulness? Are we to condemn the whole conversion and baptism of Northern Europe because mass baptisms are not in accord with the teaching or practice of the apostolic Church? Are mass movements in India to fall under the same condemnation? Again, think what history has made of Episcopacy—the primitive monarchical bishop, the Celtic bishop of the seventh century, the mediæval prelate, the modern bishop. The functions of ordination and supervision remain, but much has changed. Are all these post-apostolic developments simply sin, or, failures and shortcomings admitted, are they within the scope of God's will for His Church?

The answer of an interesting essay, first read to a Conference at Cambridge two years ago and now published along with four others,[1] is that we must admit that development is a necessity for the Church's life and, indeed, part of God's will for His Church. We cannot contract out of history. We cannot go back to reproduce the pattern of the New Testament Church to-day, nor can we assume that all development has been healthy and valid. The Church is set in history and conditioned by history, and yet not wholly so, for it is set free in the response of faith to grow up in all things into Him which is the Head, even Christ. That leaves some important questions unanswered; for example, what are the criteria of true development? Perhaps the answer is that such criteria cannot be fully established in advance. May it not be that the Church is called to go out, not knowing whither it goes, but

[1] *Scripture and Tradition* (Lutterworth Press; 9s. 6d. net). The essay in question is by Archdeacon D. E. W. Harrison of Sheffield.

trusting that the Spirit will indeed guide into all truth? If we must take history seriously, even more must we take the guidance of the Spirit seriously.

This question of Scripture and Tradition is no mere academic problem. It bears upon the evangelistic problem—how in fact men of our generation are to be brought to and sustained in the faith. Admitting that men come to faith by responding when confronted with the Word, we must ask what, in that connexion, is meant by the Word. Is it the Bible simply? Or Bible preaching? Must it not be an embodied Word? In short, is not Christ the Word to be seen and heard by men in the life of His body which is the Church? In the words of the writer referred to above, 'There is the apostolic testimony uniquely enshrined in Holy Scripture, made living in each generation by the work of the Holy Spirit, but only truly made living in a Church which like her Lord is identified with the world in its achievement *and* its tragedy. . . . All through history there is the life of that community which Christ continuously creates and sustains, His body; living in history, taking up human history into itself. That new creation into which we are incorporated, if it is faithful to its mission, constantly creates a living tradition of which the authority, though never final, is nevertheless real.'

How does the perennial science and religion question stand now? No one is better qualified to tell us than Professor C. A. Coulson, both a believing and practising Christian and Rouse Ball Professor of Mathematics in the University of Oxford; and that is what he has done in the Rede Lecture for 1954—*Science and Religion: A Changing Relationship*.[1]

Admitting the profound influence both of science and religion on man's life and thought, he is sure that nothing is to be gained by any attempted division of phenomena into those labelled scientific and those labelled religious. Such attempts have never proved satisfactory: and the division itself is false to the true character both of religion and of science. The attempt to find a boundary line between the two spheres is futile. Christian apologists have been too ready to seize upon any suggestion that seemed to indicate such a line and leave a little space wherein God might be supposed to act. Heisenberg's Uncertainty Principle in physics, the admission that the fundamental physical laws are statistical in character, and more recently the phenomena of parapsychology and extra-sensory perception have all been greeted with enthusiasm because they seemed to leave more room for God. Our author will have none of this. The only God one might find on that kind of road is a God scarcely adequate to merit our attention, let alone our worship. God can be neither at the end of science, nor tucked away in a corner inside science. If He is in Nature at all, He must be there from beginning to end. We had better be careful how we enlist the aid of the scientist in marking out a sphere for God, for if a question about Nature can be posed in scientific terms, then ultimately it will be susceptible of a scientific answer. The scientist can indeed help religious folk, but not in this way.

One sphere where the relationship of science and religion shows a change is our view of the objectivity of Nature. To the older scientists Nature was an objective reality existing wholly independent of man; and man as scientist could explore and catalogue and then formulate the laws regulating Nature. The modern scientist, however, admits that he is doing pretty much what the artist, the poet and the saint are doing—framing concepts, models, patterns which help him to make sense out of the variety of his experiences. In this connexion Professor Coulson recalls that in the Genesis story, while God made the animals it was Adam who gave them their names; so that in a sense they became dependent on man and known to him in a way of his devising. There is a parallel here to the mutual relationship of objective and subjective in scientific discovery.

Another sphere in which the relationship between science and religion seems to have changed is our approach to the centrality of man. Science, by its finding that the age of the universe is of the order of six thousand million years, and that our earth is but a tiny appendage to a medium-sized star, faces religion with a pointed issue: either Nature has a value independent of man and is something in which God can rejoice for its own sake, or it is merely a stage—an unnecessarily large one it might seem—on which man is set to play his part. For himself Professor Coulson holds that we are being led to rediscover the sacramental value of Nature as fulfilling part of God's being, and to understand how in the Genesis story, before man was brought on the scene, God could look round on the first days of creation and find that all was good.

Further, some of the most powerful modern scientific theories, Einstein's theory of relativity, for example, have been built round this very lack

[1] Cambridge University Press; 2s. 6d. net.

of centrality in man's position in the universe. Science out of the richness of its theories and models is reminding us again of the wholeness and unity of things. Thus Professor COULSON suggests that we must widen our thought of God till, in Pascal's phrase, He is 'a circle whose centre is everywhere, and whose circumference nowhere.' Again, he suggests that we may think of the physical universe 'as a painting, large in extent and varied in colour: and God is, as it were, the canvas on which the painting depends. When someone asks us what we mean by God, and how we could tell if He should happen to die, we can reply that "the whole show," and not just this or that part of it, reflects His power, His purpose, His creativeness.'

It would seem, then, that the scientist as he follows his proper procedures is more in touch with sacred things than he realizes. Science may be said to be one of the languages in which God can be described. Hence Professor COULSON can say that 'in its methods of working, in its dependence upon the assumption of a spiritual wholeness about life, in its insistence upon the richness and variety of experience, and the inter-relatedness of all things within the rôle of a person, the changing pattern of science has come back to something more like harmony with the Christian faith: but in that new harmony there are new notes which would never have sounded but for the patience, the integrity, the creative imagination of men of science.'

Contemporary Religious Trends

The Old Testament

BY PROFESSOR G. HENTON DAVIES, THE UNIVERSITY OF DURHAM

THE revival in Old Testament studies goes on apace. On the one hand new journals in the Semitic field have appeared, and new teaching posts in Old Testament studies at the Universities have been instituted or are being planned. The British Society for Old Testament Study, which requires a knowledge of Hebrew from those seeking membership, is growing in membership and influence. New Old Testament Societies abroad have been founded, and international conferences of Old Testament scholars are held at regular intervals. Noteworthy too are the new Roman Catholic interest in Biblical studies, and the recent meeting of the British Society in Rome, when the Pontifical Biblical Institute acted as hosts.

On the other hand there is the recollection that it was our Lord Himself who gave the Old Testament the status of Bible. Indeed the Old Testament was His Bible. This recollection is slowly reversing the tendencies of a generation and more ago to by-pass or to take the Old Testament for granted. Theological faculties in British Universities are beginning to send out as scripture specialists into the schools men and women trained in one or both of the Biblical languages, and who are versed in the scientific-spiritual understanding of the Scriptures. Theological students, too, in some centres are beginning to embrace rather than to avoid the learning of Hebrew, deeming it to be seemly that the servants of the Word should have some knowledge of the sacred tongues.

Nevertheless it is difficult in the course of a short article to convey the vitality and thrill of contemporary Old Testament studies. There are so many investigators in so many countries, including the Far East, and so many new lines of study and thought, that any two articles by different writers would only partially overlap.

Archaeology and Internationalism

No doubt everybody would begin with the findings of archaeology, which are not only revolutionising Old Testament study, but are also giving that study a point of view. Palestine, the land-bridge of three continents, is part of the Fertile Crescent and of the Southern Steppe, and so the life, history, literature and religion of Palestine must be studied in the light of the larger whole. Thus the study of the Old Testament is being internationalised because of the ever increasing discovery of its Semitic context. The Old Testament is an international book, with perhaps, as Millar Burrows has said, its widest perspective in the patriarchal age, and so it is as well that it is being studied internationally to-day. How relevant and how challenging in our contemporary situation are the first five words of Ps 24.

It is not merely that the obvious periods of Israel's history are to be interpreted in the light of the imperial backgrounds. There are, for example, the Mesopotamian discoveries, recently reviewed in these pages, which are re-habilitating

patriarchal nomenclature, journeys, customs and laws. Henceforth the minimum interpretation of patriarchal religion will be polytheistic, for such is the background now revealed to us. Against that background the possibility of an Abrahamic henotheism, such as that of Gn 12^{1-3} is by no means so improbable as has been considered. That passage also suggests that universalism is by no means the discovery of the great Second Isaiah, for it is apparently indigenous in certain strands of Yahwism.

Similarly the religious movement initiated by Moses must be understood though not completely evaluated in the light of the almost contemporary monotheistic tendencies associated with the Ikhnaton movement in Egypt, and with the mention of Varuna and Mithra in international life of the same period. In the same way Second Isaiah's context is the philosophical and religious movements a little later in Greece, in India and in China, as if there were a world stirring of the Spirit at that time. Again the problems of the exodus from Egypt are in reality part of the problem of the growth of Israel, as it came to nationhood and entered the way of the world.

The findings of archaeology not only illumine Biblical words and phrases, and how greatly increasing is our debt to our philologists, and provide parallels for Israelite customs, ideas and institutions, but are also in fact laying down a new standard for Old Testament study. The Old Testament, itself an international book, may only be studied in the light of its great international context.

The Literature and the Cult

The findings of archaeology and the study of Semitic literatures much more ancient than the Old Testament are inevitably affecting established positions in Old Testament criticism. From many centres, and especially from Scandinavian countries, there are important attacks on the generally accepted critical reconstruction. These attacks have achieved some measure of success, but in order to measure this success it is necessary to understand what is being attacked.

It is not always realized that the critical reconstruction was in two parts. It was (*a*) A theory concerning the mosaic of documents which make up the Pentateuch. The documents were styled and dated as J. 850, E. 750, D. 621 and P. 398 all of course B.C. There have also been divisions within the J. and P. documents. (*b*) An account of Old Testament religion along evolutionary lines from patriarchal animism to henotheism, and thence to ethical monotheism and spiritual universalism.

It is not too much to say that (*b*) is dying if it is not already quite dead. (*a*) has been considerably modified, but it is by no means dying, and it is certainly not dead. There are some in Britain who confidently assert that the critical reconstruction is dead, but generally speaking they have overlooked the fact that the reconstruction was in two parts. Some Scandinavian scholars would claim that (*a*) too was dead. Thus Professor Engnell, following the lead of Professor J. Pedersen, believes that Ex 1–15 is the central complex of a narrative work, Genesis to Numbers, called by Engnell the 'P work' or the 'Tetrateuch.' So far, though his influence is growing as he moderates his case, Professor Engnell has not convinced British scholarship that the J.E.D.P. reconstruction is entirely wrong. Nevertheless much of Engnell's protest and many of his ideas concerning the problem of transmission are beneficial and welcome.

There are a number of considerations which must be quite briefly stated.

(1) Despite many attacks on the J.E.D.P. system, there is no agreed alternative.

(2) It is agreed that more attention should be paid to oral tradition as one, though not the only, factor in the problem of the transmission of Old Testament material.

(3) There appears to be a growing respect for the trustworthiness of traditions underlying the Old Testament material. Some have suggested a source anterior and basic to J. and E., a sort of Pentateuchal Q.

(4) Doubt concerning the existence of E. in the sense of a document parallel to J. is increasing, but the existence of the J. and P. streams of material within the Tetrateuch is still firmly established, even though the approach and the interpretation of the history and contents of these streams of traditions are different from the old literary criticism of the J. and P. documents.

(5) The isolation of short credal nuclei, such as Dt 26^{5b-9} and Jos 24^{2b-13}, etc., and the consequent discovery of dominant themes in Old Testament traditions, have illuminated the literary history of the streams of tradition.

(6) It is even possible that presently Engnell's view of two great tradition works, P, that is Genesis to Numbers, and D, that is Deuteronomy to 2 Kings, will be seen to supplement and not to deny a J.D.P. scheme. Certainly Engnell frankly recognizes non-P material in Gn 2^{4bff}, but cannot bring himself to call it J.

(7) The storm centre of Pentateuchal criticism has for the moment shifted from Deuteronomy to Exodus and to the Passover Legend, but here, too, S. Mowinckel has shown the weakness of the Passover Legend theory as a nucleus for a new understanding of the Pentateuch.

(8) Nevertheless the present attempt to explain the shaping and the transmission of Old Testament material in terms of the requirements of the cult is probably sounder than the older view which actually described J. and E. as 'Prophetical narratives.'

(9) Nevertheless this cultic appraisal need not destroy or make irrecoverable the trustworthiness of the underlying historical traditions, as some of the cultic exponents would have us believe. If the traditions were striking enough or distinguished enough to undergo a cultic glorification or a transformation in faith, they were also striking enough to sustain themselves in their new cultic form. It is strange that Form-Criticism which has made such a contribution to the history of the literature of both Testaments through its quest for the '*Sitz im Leben*' of the literature, should have neglected or denied what is an earlier point in that history, namely, the point of actual origin of the literature, what may be called the *Sitz in der Geschichte*. In other words contemporary interpretation of the '*Sitz im Leben*' confuses or identifies the point of origin and the point of transmission.

(10) The Dead Sea Scrolls, important no less for the New Testament, come to confirm the growing respect for the Massoretic text of the Hebrew Bible, especially in the ever increasing light which the philologists are able to throw on the language.

The battle of the Pentateuch continues, and the new cultic approach is being applied, no doubt somewhat indiscriminately, to other parts and books of the Old Testament. The prophets and their writings are being re-interpreted and re-assessed so that they appear as the reformers and not the pioneers of religion against the liturgical background of a religion more ancient than they. Lately, too, Dr. S. Stein, of London University, has given us the term '*Heilsgesetz*' a useful tool for the understanding of Israelite law, so much part of the ancient Semitic law codes. Slowly too the pre-exile history of Israel's Wisdom movement is coming to light, and the Wise are emerging not merely as the post-exilic successors of the prophets on a lower level, but also as the pre-exilic contemporaries of the prophets on a different but equally valid level.

Old Testament Religion and the Cult

As in the fields of Old Testament literature, so too in the various aspects of the study of the religion of Israel, the ferment of a new approach is at work. The evolutionary account of the development of Israel's religion is giving place to a more realist explanation showing periods of advance and retard, an explanation which more closely corresponds to the account of the Biblical narratives themselves, and to the ancient Jewish interpretations. Similarly the 'intellectual' and literary view of Israel's religion is giving way to a more concrete exposition in terms of a practising faith and a covenantal liturgy. Cherished distinctions are breaking down, for the priest is seen to be also a teacher of religion as well as a cultic expert, and the prophet a 'specialist in prayer' as well as the spokesman of God. Cultic holiness is no less the vehicle of grace and the fount of good conduct than ethical morality. Indeed there is a theistic reference in holiness, both cultic and ethical, which transcends its moral element, essential as that moral element is.

But prophet and priest are both giving place to the sacral king as the chief cultic figure in monarchical Israel. Sacral kingship is one of the most living issues in Old Testament and other fields of study, and it is important not only for the study of the Psalms but as providing a prototype for the Messiah, for the Suffering Servant of Second Isaiah, and for the Danielic Son of Man. There seems little doubt but that Davidic kingship will link up and explain various tracts of Scripture.

It is necessary at this point to draw an important distinction, often overlooked, between the cultic interpretation of Israel's religion and literature, especially the Psalms, on the one hand, and a particular illustration of this new cultic point of view exemplified in the theory of an Israelite celebration of a New Year Festival comparable with, if different from, similar festivals celebrated at certain centres in the ancient Near East. To many scholars the hypothesis of a sacral kingship and a Yahwistic and covenantal New Year festival in Israel may not carry conviction, though no doubt many more will be convinced when Professor A. R. Johnson will shortly publish his work on sacral kingship, and when the revised edition of Professor S. H. Hooke's *Myth and Ritual* appears. It cannot be sufficiently urged that inability to accept the theory of annual New Year Festival in Israel does not preclude acceptance of the new cultic approach to the Old Testament in general and to the Psalms in particular.

To give an illustration. Professor S. Mowinckel has put us all in his debt for his interpretation of the Psalms in the light of this New Year Festival. This interpretation is offered in terms of his idea of 'cultic actuality' and not 'poetic fiction,' creative phrases of great suggestiveness. For Mowinckel the Psalms, the great majority of them, as many as one hundred and forty of them, have been composed and used as cult-psalms. With this idea of 'cultic actuality' Mowinckel has

given us a key for the study of the Psalms, but no doubt some will be unable to go further than this. Others will say that 'cultic actuality' plus a number of other factors add up to a Yahwistic New Year Festival. But 'cultic actuality' as a new approach to the majority of the Psalms, will stand apart entirely from the question of the annual Festival. The gain in the study of the Psalms is immense, and it is a pity that this approach, apart entirely from the question of the Festival, is not better known among those who study, use or teach the Psalms in this country. The writer would here gratefully acknowledge his debt to Mowinckel, a debt that continues and grows.

For Mowinckel and many others, then, the Psalms are the Prayer Book of the *first* temple as well as of the second. If this view is true, then it will be seen to raise major issues for the Old Testament religion. What becomes, for example, of the dependence of the Psalms upon the Second Isaiah? It would appear that it is the great prophet who is the debtor, and that he is echoing the universalism of the Psalms, and of the cult behind the Psalms, and of something behind the cult, in the world-wide range of his teaching. Perhaps Second Isaiah, even if he composed for the cult, is at the same time appearing as one of the great de-culticisers, transforming the rites, the themes and the chief person of the pre-exilic cult into the lyrical poetry of the Return of Yahweh to His people, of the proclaiming of the good news in connexion with that Return, and of the Suffering Servant. It is well known how indebted scholarship is to the researches into the Ebed Yahweh problem made by Professors H. H. Rowley and especially C. R. North. When to their work is added the new approach of Professor J. Lindblom who is concerned not with the identity of the Servant, but with the meaning of the Songs, it will be seen that new possibilities are beginning to open up in this most vital field of Old Testament studies.

In short, the originality of the Second Isaiah is thus far more intelligible to us in the light of Exodus and of the pre-exilic cult, as likewise in the light of that great school of Isaiah of Jerusalem, of whom the Second Isaiah was doubtless one of the most distinguished products.

Theology and Mythology

No doubt most people would end an article of this kind with some reference to the theology of the Old Testament. Here again the problem is by no means solved, the problem, that is, of how to convey the deepest meaning, the theological truth of the Old Testament. Let it be emphatically stated that the Bible is NOT a theological treatise, though it is the quarry from which such teaching may be excavated. Some do this by writing monographs on single topics of Old Testament theology, and a number of valuable studies have thus appeared. By and large it is true to say that such monographs show a tendency to neglect or to minimise the fact that the revelation in the Old Testament is given through history. What amounts to very much the same thing is that there is a tendency in such monographs to consider the selected topics ideally, that is, without taking into consideration the effect of sin and of idolatry, as these are described in the Old Testament.

On the other hand, others dig from the quarry and produce the well-known studies of the historical development of Old Testament religion. It appears to be recognized that such studies do not do justice to the theological significance of the sacred history.

Others have sought to resolve this dilemma by interpreting the life and teaching of the Old Testament comprehensively through one single institution like covenant, or one single idea like holiness. Others have attempted historical surveys of all the major theological conceptions of the Old Testament. Other methods could also be mentioned, but the very variety of the approach testifies to the difficulty and to the attractiveness of the problem.

The problem is further complicated by the Christological issue. Some people, especially those not very well versed in Hebrew, have recourse to what is called Typology, whereby prefigurings and patterns of Christ and Christian doctrine are being sought, and of course found in all corners of the Old Testament. We must sympathize with the hunger which this Typology portends, and which is the most important thing about it. But it nevertheless is really a policy of despair, and a heretical one at that. The typological hunt is the quest for Christ in the Old Testament at the expense of Israel, and for the divinity of Christ at the expense of the humanity of Israel. Indeed much of contemporary Typology is to Biblical study what Docetism is to the study of the Person of our Lord. Docetism imagines that you enhance the divinity by minimising the humanity. Typology supposes that the divine significance of the Old Testament is best seen when you minimise or indeed overlook the Old Testament and the Israel after the flesh.

It would surely be preferable to look in the Old Testament not for types of Christ, but rather for Christ Himself. But this is a very dangerous thing to say in view of the lengths to which W. Vischer has carried this idea. But certainly there is warrant in the Gospels, in the Apostles and in

various branches of the Christian tradition to look for a pre-existent Christ in the Old Testament. But how ?

There is no doubt that we must eschew the way of the typologists and the crass actuality of the Vischer approach, for there is a more excellent way. The Christological key to the Old Testament is to be found not in a variety of types, or in particular people or particular events, but in the adumbration of a theme. Phythian-Adams, with his presentation of the idea of the ' Presence of God ' in Israel, has begun to point this more excellent way. His voice, with exceptions, has been solitary for a long time, crying in vain in an Ebionitic wilderness. However the growing interest in the mythology of the Old Testament is slowly coming to support and endorse his solitary witness. An important and contemporary question is : Did Israel possess its own indigenous mythology ? There is much mythology in the Old Testament borrowed, adopted and transformed, but is there also an Israelite mythology ? A famous Continental scholar said to me the other day : ' Theocracy has no mythology.' Let us hope that by asserting the very opposite of the truth, he had begun to stumble on the truth.

Theocracy in Israel has its own, its very own, mythology. Israel's own mythology is the mythology of theocracy, that is, the portrayal of the royal and tabernacling Presence of Yahweh in Israel. It is this theme of the Presence which is the single most important idea of the Old Testament, first in its own right within the Old Testament, and secondly, in the larger context, as the real Christological key to the Old Testament. It is the Presence-theme in the Old Testament which brings the Old Testament into the orbit of that incarnational literature known to us as The Holy Bible. It is the Presence-theme of the Old Testament and the story of the act of the Incarnation in the New Testament which contain and expound the ultimate unity of the Bible.

Literature

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. JOHN

THE long-expected publication of a full-scale commentary on St. John's Gospel by the Rev. C. K. Barrett of Durham University, is an event of first importance in the realm of New Testament studies. The new work—*The Gospel According to St. John* (S.P.C.K. ; 63s. net)—marks a decisive stage in the study of the Johannine Gospel. Since 1928 we have been largely dependent upon Archbishop J. H. Bernard's commentary on the Greek text, a scholarly work still valuable to all students, but which naturally does not take account of the flood of critical and theological studies during the last twenty-five years. This task has been accomplished by Mr. Barrett in a beautifully printed volume which contains a full introduction and a detailed exposition of the Greek text.

It may be said at once that Mr. Barrett's work is a very notable achievement. Among British commentaries on John it is without a parallel, and it is worthy to stand side by side with the great works of M.-J. Lagrange [1948] and R. Bultmann [1950]. The problems of introduction are discussed fully and with balanced judgment, and the exposition of the text is presented with that thoroughness and meticulous accuracy which we have learned to expect from Mr. Barrett's pen, as foreshadowed in his earlier book, ' The Holy Spirit in the Gospel Tradition ' [1947].

Mr. Barrett's commentary is theological as well as critical. It faces the questions, how the Gospel is to be interpreted, what is its authority, and what is its importance in Christian theology. The literary structure of the Gospel is carefully studied with special attention to the literary sources. Mr. Barrett thinks it probable that John was familiar with Mark, and to a less degree with Luke, and he shows that the Johannine discourses ' are often built upon, and contain, embedded within them, sayings identical with or similar to those of the synoptics.' He does not think it possible to posit the existence of a ' Discourse Source,' and boldly puts forward the hypothesis that the discourses ' were in the first place sermons delivered by the evangelist and subsequently (perhaps even after his death) arranged in the gospel ' (p. 17). Full consideration is given to the non-Christian background in the Old Testament, in Judaism, Greek philosophy, and the contemporary religions of salvation. As regards the *Corpus Hermeticum*, he holds that, although no direct literary relationships can be traced with its earlier stages, ' it seems clear that John was working with similar presuppositions and along similar lines ' (p. 31). The Christian background is traced in the Synoptic tradition and in the theology of St. Paul and the Primitive Church. He thinks that the writer of the First Epistle was ' a man of less profound mind than the evangelist,' and that these two, together with the author of 2 and 3 John and the final editor of Revelation, were all pupils of the original

apocalyptist, who may have been the Apostle John, the Beloved Disciple. The theology of the Gospel is examined under the headings—Eschatology, Christology, Miracles, Salvation, the Sacraments, Mysticism, the Holy Spirit and the Trinity, and the Church and its Life.

The date of the Gospel is set between A.D. 90–140. Mr. Barrett thinks that it is not possible to narrow these limits without recourse to a hypothesis regarding authorship. He observes that it must not be assumed that the date of writing and the date of publication were identical, since the Gospel may have been slow in coming to the notice of the Christian public. 'Indeed,' he says, 'we cannot be certain that the gospel was *widely* known in A.D. 140.' Ephesus seems the best choice as the place of origin because of the residue of weight in the Irenaeus tradition. The authority of the Gospel is that of the Church, the heir of the apostles and of their authority, but the Church 'so far as it rests upon the word of the apostles (xvii. 20) and is obedient to the Spirit.'

It is not possible to illustrate in much detail the exegesis of the Gospel as presented by Mr. Barrett. His explanation of the meaning of the term 'Son of Man' is of outstanding interest and also his exposition of the Paraclete sayings in 14–16. His views regarding the Appendix in 21 will be contested by many, since he detaches the whole of this chapter, and not merely *v.* 24, from the main body of the Gospel. Other points which, as it seems to the reviewer, are vulnerable are his consistent rejection of all theories of displacement, even as regards chapters 5 and 6, and 15–16, and his marked unwillingness to accept alleged 'Semitisms.' C. C. Torrey is riddled by at least twenty arrows. It is not easy to accept Mr. Barrett's assurance that the difficulty of 8^{25} 'has perhaps been exaggerated.' The most important point for subsequent debate is his suggestion that, while allowing for the strong influence of the Synoptic tradition, we must look for the origin of the discourses to the Evangelist's sermons.

There can be no doubt that, in spite of its heavy price, Mr. Barrett's commentary is one to buy and to prize, provided one looks, not so much for sermonic aids, but for a fearless, honest, scholarly, and suggestive discussion of Johannine problems. The reader will not always agree, but he will be compelled to reflect, and will be left in no doubt about the sublimity of the Fourth Gospel. This Gospel still remains, and is likely to remain, at the centre of all questions which turn upon the abiding worth of the Christian message. One could not have a better guide than Mr. Barrett, provided we are no less docile in following his lead than he is himself in handling traditional opinions.

VINCENT TAYLOR

NEW TESTAMENT THEOLOGY

Year by year the Student Christian Movement Press puts us deeper in its debt by its translations of the work of eminent Continental New Testament scholars. In the decade since the War first Cullmann and then Bultmann and Jeremias have been enabled to make their bow in an English garb. The latest *débutant* in their published lists is Ethelbert Stauffer of Erlangen whose 'Christ and the Cæsars,' reviewed in this magazine some months ago, must have whetted many appetites for his *New Testament Theology* which is just out (25s. net). It has been done into admirable English by Principal Marsh of Mansfield, and its blending of dark-blue covers with silver titling should please the most fastidious bibliophile.

Professor Stauffer, whose learning includes an expert knowledge of numismatics, iconography, and several other things besides the whole Biblical field, tells us in his Preface that he has aimed to do two things—first, to supply an introduction to New Testament thought for all who look to it for guidance on the great ultimate questions; and, second, to give the professional student 'a workman's pass' to the problems of New Testament research. In meeting both these needs he has triumphantly succeeded. The first need is met by the sixty short chapters of actual theology; the second by the learned bibliographies which preface each chapter, by the seventy pages of notes, and by the seven appendices. To accomplish all this in three hundred and seventy pages is a notable achievement (especially for a German). How has it been done? First, by reducing lexicography to a minimum by means of a *Vide* Kittel's 'Theologisches Wörterbuch' (though this is no help to those who are innocent of German), and, second (to quote himself), by wedding a Tacitean brevity of style to a mathematical precision of thought.

This is a New Testament theology with a difference. It is thematic rather than developmental. To be sure, the book begins with a brief sketch of the development of New Testament theology. But this is mere preliminary fencing with the subject, and when it is done, Stauffer turns Biblical *Systematiker* and in Part II (the heart of the book) treats all the cardinal themes of Biblical theology from the Creation to the Second Advent of Christ. Part III discusses the earliest attempts at creed-making. If this analysis of his book sounds unexciting, I have conveyed a false impression of the man Stauffer who wears his erudition very lightly, keeps his chapters and his sentences short, enlivens them with apt illustrations from art and icons, and seldom manages to be dull.

It is, of course, not to be expected that all his judgments will command assent. Some of us will

wish to demur when he claims that 'we have sufficient evidence to ascribe these five writings (the Johannine) to a common author of remarkable individuality, and great significance and to identify him as the apostle John.' Many Protestants will be startled by what he has to say about the primacy of Peter in the Primitive Church or by his description of James, the Lord's brother, as 'this last Davidian and this first curialist.' But the general approach, unvitiated by any Bultmannian scepticism, seems to us sound: not in Hellenism, and not simply in Rabbinism but in 'the old Biblical tradition' (which means the Old Testament plus the apocrypha and pseudepigrapha) are the roots of Primitive Christianity to be found; as the decisive content of the earliest preaching was not a gospel of the love of God and the love of one's neighbour (so Harnack), nor even simply a gospel of the holy God who condescended to sinners (so Holl), but the gospel of the 'Christ-event,' which is not simply just another event in man's spiritual history but *the* event which founded the Church and may be defined as the 'earthly path of the Son of God in the service of human need.'

A feature of the book is its exploration of New Testament theology in terms of three basic motifs, 'the doxological,' 'the antagonistic' and 'the soteriological.' Take, for example, Stauffer's treatment of the Resurrection. Doxologically, the Resurrection is the first decisive step the Son took on His way to final glory after His descent to earth and the darkness of hades (see the sayings of Jesus about the Son of man and the Passion narratives). The antagonistic motif appears when Christ's resurrection is seen as His triumph over all the evil powers, human and superhuman. We find the soteriological motif in passages like Ro 4^{25} (which is a pre-Pauline Christian formula):

Who was delivered up for our trespasses,
And was raised for our justification.

Another feature of the book is its wealth of epigrammatic sentence and apothegm. Let us take some specimens almost at random. 'The life of Jesus is an acted doxology.' 'Paul had a multitude of important disciples, but none of them really understood Galatians till Luther.' 'The Sermon on the Mount makes man say "No" to it, because it demands the impossible. But at the same time it calls forth an elemental "Yes," for what it requires is the only thing possible.' 'The Son of man is about the most pretentious piece of self-description that any man in the ancient East could possibly have used.' 'Good Friday is the Passover Day of universal history.' 'Any materialist conception of what took place on the first Easter Morning is quite foreign to the New Testament—but so also is any sort of spiritualization.' 'The man who fulfils the original purpose of his life is *homo orans*.' 'This world cannot receive the promises of God.'

It is a pity that we have to end our pæan of praise with one or two complaints. But grumble we must: first, that the translation is flawed by inconcinnities like 'an hierarchy,' 'an historical,' 'an unique,' etc.; second, that Stauffer's bibliographies show no real acquaintance with the best work in English; and, third, that there is no index of subjects. Having uttered our grumbles, let us finish on a note of gratitude. Here is a book every serious student of the New Testament should buy. It is the work of a rare scholar who has not allowed his learning to dim the sparkle of his style or any needless scepticism to becloud the brightness of his faith.

A. M. Hunter

GOD AND HISTORY

The purpose of *History, Prophecy and God*, by Mr. Robert Rendall (Paternoster Press; 8s. 6d. net), is 'to show that the joint-witness of Biblical history and prophecy to Christ points to a Divine purpose within and behind the flow of human affairs, and that this purpose gives spiritual significance to life. It is, therefore, in some sort a theological interpretation of history.'

With this, and with much else in this thoughtful and earnest book, readers of this journal will entirely agree. For example: 'Myths may mediate moral truths; they do not document circumstances of fact. And the Event of Christ in history is linked up with certain antecedent circumstances of fact. We cannot dismiss these without dismissing Christ.' But who does dismiss them? Mr. Rendall seems to say that 'destructive criticism' does, and, by implication, destructive critics. All critics, one infers, are 'destructive.' There are black and white, there are no half-tones. 'These things being so, we see how impossible it is to effect a compromise between the findings of destructive criticism and faith in the Divine origin of the Scriptures. The two are mutually incompatible. To the one, the Old Testament histories mediate religious truths, and nothing more: to the other, they document the circumstances of a Divine intervention in human history.'

We must ask: Who is there whom Mr. Rendall would label a 'critic' who believes that the Old Testament histories mediate religious truths, and nothing more? Or is there a responsible Christian scholar, albeit a 'critic,' who doubts that the Old Testament documents the circumstances of a Divine intervention in human history? Are we shut out from faith in Christ unless we are prepared to affirm that Lot's wife became a pillar of salt?

Are fundamentalists the only people who devoutly believe in the Scriptures? Mr. Rendall is a temperate and reasonable man, and with his main thesis no one will quarrel. But he ought to know and recognize that Christian scholars to-day are not 'naturalistic' in their approach to the Old Testament, whatever their nineteenth-century forerunners may have been. C. R. NORTH

NEW CONCEPTS OF HEALING

In these days of somewhat heated controversy about the value of Spiritual Healing, and of Spiritual Healers in general, Miss A. Graham Ikin's latest volume—*New Concepts of Healing* (Hodder and Stoughton; 12s. 6d. net)—will be welcomed. From the beginning of the revived interest in the churches she has played an important part as secretary of Archbishop Temple's Committee of Doctors and Clergy whose function it was to consider ways in which doctors and clergy could co-operate more closely, especially in what is known as psycho-neurotic disorders. In all her writings and almost in every chapter of this volume she emphasizes the need, for she sees the danger of the Church working apart from medicine and the fruitlessness of medicine working apart from a knowledge of the spiritual problems often lying at the root of mental trouble, and psychosomatic symptoms. She believes that the focus of trouble may lie on any one of four levels—the physical, the psychological, the psychical and the spiritual. But as the psycho-physical organism has no logic tight compartments the effects of disease are felt on all levels. Hence her emphasis on the necessity for diagnosis before any kind of treatment—spiritual, physical or psychological. Diagnosis would tell on which level the disease was to be attacked. 'Much so-called "spiritual healing,"' Miss Ikin writes, 'operates on the mental level via suggestion. The result may be dramatic but without insight on the part of the healer or healed, and so mental instability is often increased.' She quotes with approval Jung's statement that 'the Protestant clergyman of to-day was insufficiently equipped to cope with the psychic needs of the age.'

Critical as Miss Ikin is of spiritual healing, she devotes a chapter to cases of spiritual healing by Mrs. Salmon, Agnes Sanford, Dr. Rebecca Beard, a medical and a case of cancer by Dr. Alexis Carrel, the Nobel Prize holder. She writes suggestively of the implications of Sir James Jeans' 'New Physics,' and quotes at length from Karl Heim. Miss Ikin is not afraid to call in the help of the findings of paranormal psychology for the better understanding of the laws of spiritual healing. If anything, she is inclined to preach to the Church too much; and yet one feels that the Church needs this preaching if she is to apply to her own work all that psychology and psychotherapy are able to contribute to the understanding of the spiritual conflicts of the human soul.

J. G. MCKENZIE

THE PROTESTANT TRADITION

In recent years there have been many studies of the principal figures of the Reformation and many assessments of the relevance of its message for to-day, but none of these renders superfluous the latest to come to hand—*The Protestant Tradition*, by the Rev. Dr. J. S. Whale (Cambridge University Press; 21s. net). The learned author approaches the Reformation by way of the great names of Luther and Calvin, and alongside these he sets a third form of Protestantism—the sect-type, to whose multiplicity three principles, he suggests, may be said to give unity—the personal principle, the voluntary principle and the spiritual principle. This left-wing Protestantism — the Anabaptist-Separatist type—is congenial to the author and he expounds it sympathetically, taking account of modern research, for example Professor Bainton's study of David Joris. All this is clearly and carefully surveyed, and students will be grateful for Dr. Whale's guidance. The prime interest of most readers, however, will be in the bearing of it on modern issues. Under that heading the author discusses the Roman Church and Toleration, the Totalitarian State and the Crown Rights of the Redeemer, and Sectarian Division and the Ecumenical Movement. Space forbids comment, but the author's mind may be estimated from these quotations. 'Protestants stand for the two ideas of supernatural religion and liberty: for these two ideas in combination: and for the historic conviction that in the long run you cannot have either alone.' 'The events of our time which have intensified our traditional horror of erastianism have been a warning, too, against the frightful menace of the purely secular State, and of the national irreligion which it fosters.' 'In the ecumenical movement the Protestant tradition now finds its greatest opportunity.'

The author's clarity, vigour, and epigrammatic conciseness make the reading of this essay in interpretation a pleasure. STEWART MECHIE

In a book entitled *Religion in Prison*, by Mr. J. Arthur Hoyles (Epworth Press; 10s. 6d. net), the plea is made that Christians should have a continual concern for prisoners. It ranges over the evangelistic work done among fellow-prisoners by English Nonconformists who had been jailed; and the gradual establishment, in spite of the brutality

and callousness of prison management that prevailed till little more than a hundred years ago, of regular chaplaincy work. It reviews the difficulties and the opportunities that the modern chaplain meets in an age of changing psychological theories and experimental methods in dealing with crime. It emphasizes the amazing instances that prove to the chaplain that his work is worth while, and at the same time urges that only with the support of a Christian social attitude to the prisoner can the official ministry become really effective.

The Independent Press is issuing a series of booklets containing B.B.C. talks given by prominent Congregational ministers. Four of them have come to hand, the price of each of which is 1s. net. *Perplexing Parables*, by Principal W. Gordon Robinson, deals with the Parable of The Shrewd Steward, The Parable of the Man in Old Clothes, The Parable of the Thoughtless Bridesmaids, The Parable of Work and Wages, The Parable of the Persistent Widow, and The Parable of the Man who stumbled on a Fortune. The treatment is always suggestive and illuminating.

A Modern Epiphany, by the Rev. Cecil Northcott, shows ways in which Christians can still manifest forth Christ in the modern world. Mr. Northcott tells how at an international camp some young people were discussing ways of telling people about Christ. 'They turned to the girl from Africa. "Maria," they said, "what do you do in your country?" "Oh," said Maria, "we don't have missions or give away pamphlets. We just *send* one or two Christian families to live and work in a village, and when people see what Christians are like, then they want to be Christians too."' What a perfect epitome of ideal evangelism!

Principal John Marsh writes on *Marking Time*, a series of broadcasts leading up to New Year.

Principal Emeritus Nathaniel Micklem's series is entitled *Religion Day by Day*, and deals with Religion as Acceptance, Religion as Relaxation, Religion as Struggle, Religion as Faith, Religion as Imagination, Religion as Walking with God.

These booklets are most attractively produced; and there is no doubt that many will be glad to have these broadcast talks in permanent form.

The 'World Christian Books,' published by the Lutterworth Press, are proceeding according to plan to provide at the low cost of two shillings each, short and simply-written studies in the doctrine, life and practice of the Christian faith. The latest volumes to come to hand are *The Christian as Citizen*, by Professor John C. Bennett and *The Christian Character*, by Bishop Stephen Neill. Bishop Neill takes as the framework of his book the nine virtues listed in Gal 5, under the heading 'The Fruit of the Spirit.' Professor Bennett has five chapters dealing with 'The Christian's Social Responsibility,' 'From Christian Faith to Political Decisions,' 'The Christian and Political Authority,' 'The Christian and Political Structures,' and 'The Issues Raised by Communism.'

Both books admirably fulfil the design of the series and may be commended for study and as the basis of addresses.

A generation ago the S.C.M. published three short books by the late Principal H. Wheeler Robinson—'The Cross of Job' [1916], 'The Cross of the Servant' [1926] and 'The Cross of Jeremiah' [1925]. They have now reprinted all three in one volume under the title, *The Cross in the Old Testament* (10s. 6d. net). This is, indeed, a good deed, and if these books are as helpful to this generation as they were to the last, the S.C.M. will be well rewarded. Each book deals with the problem of suffering, for this problem was one of the major problems confronting all three authors—'Job,' Second-Isaiah, and Jeremiah. But the two main reasons for welcoming this volume are: first, here we see Wheeler Robinson at his best, for in studies like these he combined scholarly with spiritual insight to the highest degree. Second, this volume shows that a student of the Old Testament need not be a fundamentalist in order 'to find my Saviour there.' Nor need he abandon himself to allegorical interpretations or any sort of typography. Here is straight, modern scholarship issuing in sound evangelical doctrine. The volume is in every way to be commended to preachers.

Despite the mass of print that has already been published about the Second Assembly of the World Council of Churches held at Evanston in August 1954, one can give a cordial welcome to the official record of the occasion—*The Evanston Report*, edited by Dr. Visser 't Hooft (S.C.M.; 25s. net).

The ordinary reader will find the first half of the volume the more interesting. It contains, among other things, the reports of the six sections, a narrative account of each day's events and an outline of the speeches and discussions. Many, however, will turn to the latter part of the volume where are the reports of the Assembly committees, the list of member churches and a series of valuable appendices. Among these we direct attention to a statement on the Hope of Israel, a statement by delegates of the Dutch Reformed Churches in South Africa, a statement of the Eastern Orthodox delegates concerning the main theme of the Assembly, and the report of the joint-committee of the International Missionary Council and the World Council of Churches. There is material here for much fruitful study.

Important Hypotheses Reconsidered

I. The Proto-Luke Hypothesis

By the Reverend Principal Vincent Taylor, D.D., F.B.A.

There is no doubt that the time is ripe for a reconsideration of the Proto-Luke Hypothesis. The description of current opinion by Professor A. M. Hunter [1] mentioned in my introductory article correctly indicates the existing situation. The hypothesis has been widely accepted, and attempts to disprove it have been comparatively few, but there is undoubtedly a hesitation to use it in constructive work and a feeling in many quarters that it attempts too great a precision in its use of primary data.

In what follows I shall attempt to discuss (*a*) the principal objections which have been raised, and (*b*) the bearings which these objections have upon the hypothesis. It is necessary to indicate clearly what elements in the hypothesis are speculative, or unsound, and what features in it seem likely to be of permanent benefit to Synoptic Criticism.

I shall not attempt to argue again the case for the hypothesis in detail, for its basis seems to me to be sufficiently set forth in B. H. Streeter's *Four Gospels* [1924] and in my own discussion in *Behind the Third Gospel* [1926]. For purposes of reference, however, it may be useful to summarize the arguments on which the hypothesis has been held to rest.

I

The main arguments may be summarized as follows :

(1) The Lukan Passion Narrative is not simply a recast of the Markan account, but is based on a non-Markan narrative of the Passion which, when embodied in the Third Gospel, was expanded by the aid of extracts from Mark.

(2) The same structure is visible in the Eschatological Discourse of Lk 21, but it is uncertain how much, if any, of this material formed part of Proto-Luke.

(3) On a larger scale the same arrangement can be seen in Lk 3–20. Alternate belts of Markan and non-Markan material exist side by side, and while the non-Markan sections have a relative continuity, the Markan sections are topical panels which supplement Proto-Luke.

(4) Q, as it is seen in the Third Gospel, appears to have been expanded at an earlier date by the addition of L tradition.

(5) The omission of so much Markan material from the Third Gospel, amounting roughly to nearly one half of that source, is best explained if Mark was used as a supplementary document, and not as the foundation of Luke.

(6) The elaborate sixfold date in Lk $3^{1f.}$ reads like the beginning of a source. This impression is supported by the place of the genealogy in Lk 3^{23-38}, by the implications of the Lukan Preface in 1^{1-4}, and by the procedure adopted in the composition of the Acts of the Apostles in the use of the ' We-sections.'

The argument in this summary statement is cumulative. The hypothesis finds room for all the features described above, and thus explains a wide range of facts. It can be weakened, but not disproved, by contesting any one of these arguments. The failure to consider it as a whole accounts, in my submission, for the fact that the hypothesis has not been overturned. Concentration upon single issues only serves to leave the mind in suspense. This is what has happened. No full-scale refutation has been attempted, but only isolated forays upon outposts or important bastions. Nevertheless, points have been made which need to be taken into account by those who accept the hypothesis as substantially sound. These will be indicated and discussed in the present article.

The main criticisms brought against the hypothesis are those of Professor J. M. Creed,[2] Dr. J. W. Hunkin,[3] the Rev. C. S. Petrie,[4] Professor A. Barr,[5] Professor G. D. Kilpatrick,[6] and Professor S. MacLean Gilmour.[7] I do not feel it necessary to discuss isolated opinions unsupported by argument. Thus, Professor R. H. Lightfoot

[1] *Interpreting the New Testament*, 42 f.

[2] *The Gospel according to St. Luke*, pp. lviii n., lxiv, 86, 140, 262.

[3] *The Journal of Theological Studies*, xxviii. [April, 1927], 250–262.

[4] *The Expository Times*, liv. 172–177.

[5] *The Expository Times*, lv. 227–231.

[6] *The Journal of Theological Studies*, xliii. 34–36 ; N.S. i. 56–60.

[7] *The Journal of Biblical Literature*, lxvii. 143–152. See also his commentary on Luke in *The Interpreter's Bible*, vol. viii.

described the hypothesis as ' extremely doubtful ' [1] and as ' misleading and unnecessary,' [2] but in a reprint of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES article in his *Gospel Message of St. Mark* he dropped the phrase ' extremely doubtful,' but retained the opinion that ' the results have not been commensurate with the expenditure of labour,' pointing out that the hypothesis is less widely accepted on the Continent and in America than it is in Great Britain.[3] Sir Edwin Hoskyns and the Rev. Noel F. Davey expressed the opinion that Professor Creed has made Dr. Streeter's hypothesis ' untenable ' at least in the form in which it was stated.[4] Canon A. Richardson spoke of it as an ' interesting conjecture ' and as ' not proven,' [5] and recently Dr. A. Farrer has described it as ' a theory which still has adherents ' and even as ' incapable of reasonable defence.' [6] I do not propose also to quote the opinions of many writers who substantially accept the hypothesis, except that of Dr. W. F. Howard who wrote in 1952 : ' It seems to me that the main arguments of Streeter . . . have never been successfully refuted.' [7] It is perhaps necessary, even in passing, to refer to the frequent claim that the theory has not been endorsed by Continental and American scholars. R. Bultmann's comments on the tradition in the Lukan Passion Narrative can be seen in his *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition* (pp. 284, 290, 292 f., 302 f.), and those of J. Jeremias on Lk 22^{15-30} in *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, 69 f. F. C. Grant's endorsement is emphatic in his *Growth of the Gospels*, 9, 170, B. W. Bacon's comment in his *Studies in Matthew*, 505, and B. S. Easton's views on the L tradition in his commentary on Luke. On the other side, the hypothesis is rejected by W. Bussmann (*Synoptische Studien*) and by Léon Vaganay (*Le problème synoptique*). The objections of M. Goguel, in an article [8] which I have not seen, are summarized by Mr. C. S. C. Williams in the second edition of McNeile's *Introduction to the Study of the New Testament*, 61.

II

(1) The criticisms of Professor J. M. Creed, in the footnote on p. lviii. of his commentary on St. Luke, were effectively answered by B. H. Streeter himself in the Preface to the fourth impression of *The Four Gospels*.[9] Appeal is constantly made to this footnote. It must be left to the reader to consider whether Professor Creed's remarks on the ' amorphous collection of narrative and discourse ' in Proto-Luke, his argument based on the presence of Markan passages in Lk $3^{3.\ 16}$, and in the Lukan Passion Narrative, and his claim that it is improbable that Luke would have interpolated occasional sentences and verses from Mark are convincing. The last suggestion needs to be esteemed in the light of four more or less independent claims that Luke has done this very thing in compiling the Eschatological Discourse of Lk 21.[10] I suggest that the time has come to abandon the argument that Lk 21^{20-36} shows how freely Luke can edit his Markan source. In reply to Creed's contention A. M. Perry justly replies : ' I must beg leave to differ . . . it is exactly what any one who rejects the Proto-Luke hypothesis has to assume that he [Luke] *has* done with Mark, surely a " full and independent narrative." ' [11] It should be remembered that, while Professor Creed affirmed that Mark was a determining factor in the construction of Luke from the outset, he recognized that this ' is not necessarily inconsistent with the hypothesis that Q and some of Luke's peculiar material may have been already combined, and may have lain before Luke as a single document.' [12] He admits that the case for regarding Lk 22^{19a} as an insertion is attractive, and that Lk $23^{26.\ 34b.\ 44f.}$ might be so interpreted ' if the rest of the evidence favoured this view,' but rejects this explanation in the case of other Markan passages (THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, xlvi. 104). In all, I do not think that Professor Creed's criticisms went deep or shook Streeter's hypothesis.

(2) Dr. J. W. Hunkin frankly conceded the existence of a document Q+L, but held that the Lukan elements in the Passion Narrative belonged to the Evangelist's detached notes (L^1) rather than to Q+L. He admitted that Q, worked over and improved upon by Luke, enters into the Third Gospel only through the document Q+L, but maintained that the latter had been fitted into the Markan framework.[13] This view, he says in *The New Testament : A Conspectus* [1950], 78, ' is a modification of the theory of Streeter and

[1] *The Expository Times*, liii. 51.
[2] *History and Interpretation in the Gospels*, 164.
[3] *Op. cit.*, 99.
[4] *The Riddle of the New Testament*, 16 f.
[5] *The Gospels in the Making*, 18 f.
[6] *A Study in St. Mark*, 210.
[7] *The London Quarterly and Holborn Review*, Jan., 1952.
[8] *The Harvard Theological Review*, xxvi. 1–55.
[9] P. xiii f.
[10] Cf. A. M. Perry, *The Sources of Luke's Passion-Narrative*, 38 ; V. Taylor, *Behind the Third Gospel*, 109–125 ; T. W. Manson, *The Sayings of Jesus*, 328–337 ; C. H. Dodd, in *The Journal of Roman Studies*, xxxvii. 47–54.
[11] *The Expository Times*, xlvi. 259.
[12] *The Gospel according to St. Luke*, lviii. n.
[13] *The Journal of Theological Studies* [April, 1927].

Vincent Taylor.' In reply,[1] I attempted to show that Dr. Hunkin's form of the hypothesis does not take into consideration all the relevant data. It does not explain why so much of Mark is omitted, and how it comes about that the Markan sections in Luke supply the deficiencies of Q+L. Dr. Hunkin made much of the fact that the percentage of Markan words in Lk 21^{5-36} is only thirty-seven per cent (as compared with fifty-two per cent in Lk 3-20), and claimed that we must recognize that ' St. Luke uses Mark with a degree of freedom which varies considerably from time to time.' I have already questioned the legitimacy of this appeal to Lk 21, at any rate so far as vv. 20–36 are concerned. Dr. Hunkin's opinion runs counter to Professor H. J. Cadbury's views of Luke's use of his sources as set forth in *The Style and Literary Method of Luke* [1919–20], a scholarly work which has not been surpassed or rivalled in Great Britain. His words are worth recalling when scholars speak of Luke's ' editorial activity.' Of the prefaces and summaries in which Luke deviates most from Mark, Professor Cadbury writes: ' With extraordinary fidelity Luke avoids amplifying or exaggerating his source in these summaries of Jesus' work of fame,' [2] and of the sayings he says: ' But the words of Jesus themselves, the *verba ipsissima*, whether reported by Mark or found in the source designated Q, have rarely been retouched by the author of the Third Gospel to give them a wider scope or application.' [3] These opinions need to be remembered if Luke's use of Mark in his Passion Narrative is considered. Luke does far more than merely edit Mark. He deviates from Mark's order twelve times and yet introduces Markan elements almost exactly in their Markan order, so that they have every appearance of being ' insertions ' in Proto-Luke. Dr. Hunkin's rejoinder that the ' insertions ' provide ' a table of contents of Lk xxii. 14-xxiv. 12 ' [4] does not survive a critical appraisal of these passages, since the list consists of six sayings, a list, a quotation, two narratives, and references to four details in the Markan Passion story; and, if the list is extended, its substance does not amount to much more.

(3) The closely reasoned argument of the Rev. S. S. Petrie's article (THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, liv. 172–177) suffers, I think, from the fact that its attention is limited to the Galilean section, Lk 3^{1}-9^{50}. In particular, the contention that about half this section is Markan does not take us far, since the longer following section, Lk 9^{51}-18^{14}, contains no Markan elements, and since the extent to which a source is used in a portion of a Gospel does not necessarily stamp it as basic. No more force, I suggest, is given by the claim that, on any showing, the genealogy is an awkward insertion, for it does not appear, as in Matthew, in the Birth stories, but after the first reference to Jesus, if Proto-Luke begins with the elaborate date in $3^{1f.}$ The strength of Mr. Petrie's criticism appears in his claim that the complete proscription of Mark from Lk 3^{1-22} and 4^{1-13} is not warranted. His argument that Lk $3^{3.16}$ are Markan, as not a few writers have observed, is strong, less so, I believe, as regards Lk $3^{2b.\ 4.\ 21f.}$ and $4^{1f.}$ That the phrases, ' preaching the baptism unto the remission of sins ' (Lk 3^{3}) and ' the latchet of whose shoes I am not worthy to unloose ' (Lk 3^{16}), come from Mark ($1^{4.\ 7}$) is probable, although other explanations are possible. But the traces of Mark in Lk 3^{1}-4^{30} are too few to rebut the contention that in substance the section is non-Markan.

The claim that Lk 6^{13-19} is Markan (cf. Mk 3^{7-19}) is also strongly argued.[5] Many scholars share this opinion, but, while some use of Mark is possible, it is far from being assured. The differences between Lk 6^{12-16} and Mk 3^{13-19} are considerable, in spite of the fact that both contain a list of the Twelve, naturally with much in common. Of the twenty-five words common to Lk 6^{17-19} and Mk 3^{7-12} only *πλῆθος πολύ* and *ἅπτ(εσθαι) αὐτοῦ* are important, and in the former case the original Markan text is probably *πολὺς ὄχλος*.[6] There is much weight in Professor Creed's contention, that it would be a remarkable coincidence if Proto-Luke prefaced the Sermon with two sections in juxtaposition with two at the conclusion of the first part of Mark, which *ex hypothesi* is quite independent. But it must also be considered that there is nothing in Mark, beyond references to crowds, to account for the introduction of the Sermon by Matthew and Luke at this point in the Markan outline. Their agreement suggests the use of a non-Markan source, perhaps Q, from which much that is now found in Lk 6^{12-19} may have been derived. B. S. Easton points out that Mk $3^{7f.}$ are quite inconspicuous, and says, ' Apparently Q's version of the Sermon had a preface something like Mk iii. 7 f., including perhaps an account of the choice of the Twelve. And the " mount " may well have stood in Q as an intentional parallel to Sinai.' [7] These suggestions are speculative, but they show how complicated the situation is. We may have to allow for the use of both Mark and a non-Markan source.

[1] *The Journal of Theological Studies* [Jan., 1928].

[2] *Op. cit.*, 108.

[3] *Op. cit.*, 124.

[4] Lk $22^{19a.\ 22.\ 34.\ 46b.}$ (?). $^{50b.\ 52-3a.\ 54b-61}$, $23^{3.\ 26.\ 34b.}$ (?). $^{38.\ 44f.\ 50-4.}$, 24^{10} (?).

[5] So Mr. Petrie, *ib.*, 174 f.

[6] Cf. V. Taylor, *The Gospel according to St. Mark*, 226.

[7] *The Gospel according to St. Luke*, 81.

(4) The view that the Lukan Passion Narrative is fundamentally non-Markan has naturally invited attention, although not with the fulness of discussion which so important a question demands.

In the two valuable articles mentioned above, Professor G. D. Kilpatrick has brought forward two objections against the hypothesis. He suggests that *δίκαιος* in the centurion's words in Lk 23^{47} means 'innocent,' and that Luke has altered 'Son of God' in Mk 15^{39} in accordance with his desire to stress the innocence of Jesus in the light of later contacts with the more educated elements in the Roman empire. He deduces further that much more belongs to the Evangelist, with the result that 'all trace of a continuous Passion narrative other than that of Mark as a source for Luke vanishes.' He also points out that *νομικός* is used in the non-Markan strata of Luke, and that *γραμματεύς* in $22^{2.\ 66}$, 23^{10} reflects the use of Mark. In reply it may be argued that it is difficult to suppose that Luke has altered 'Son of God' in favour of 'innocent man.' The latter is better explained as part of a different tradition. Moreover, interest in the innocence of Jesus may be a characteristic mark of the Lukan Passion Narrative, not merely a modification of Mark. *Νομικός* supplies a welcome addition to the vocabulary distinctive of the non-Markan parts of Luke. Two examples of *γραμματεύς* in 22^{66} and 23^{10} (22^{2} does not belong to Proto-Luke) may suggest the influence of Mark, but the word is used four times in the Acts and affords too slender a ground for the total rejection of a Lukan Passion Narrative.

Professor A. Barr's criticisms go farther. He maintains that in short narratives in Luke a low rate of correspondence with Mark is usual, especially around points of juncture with non-Markan passages, and that, therefore, the smaller Markan element in the Lukan Passion Narrative is intelligible. The composition of Lk 22^{14}-24^{11}, he suggests, can be explained on these assumptions.

In reply it is pertinent to point out that of eight examples adduced as showing a reduced correspondence with Mark ($4^{40f.\ 42-44}$, $6^{12-16.\ 17-19}$, $9^{28-36.\ 43b-45}$, $19^{37-40.\ 47f.}$) the Markan origin of four ($6^{12-16.\ 17-19}$, $19^{37-40.\ 47f.}$) is open to question, and that in the remaining four the percentage of Markan words is as high as thirty-seven to thirty-nine per cent. Further, some short Lukan narratives have a high degree of correspondence with Mark (Lk $19^{45f.}$ is a striking example). What is more, the same is true of the undoubted Markan passages in the existing Passion Narrative, which contain clusters of Markan words (*e.g.*, Lk $23^{44f.}$).

The whole problem calls for closer study, and it is possible that a somewhat greater use of Mark should be allowed for than supporters of the Proto-Luke Hypothesis have admitted.[1] Further reference to this point will be made later.

(5) Much of Professor Gilmour's criticism[2] is directed against the view that Proto-Luke was a complete Gospel. It seems hard that those who first framed the hypothesis should be saddled with the exaggerations of enthusiastic supporters. Streeter did go so far as to describe Proto-Luke as a kind of 'half-way house' to a gospel, but he did not claim more. In *Behind the Third Gospel* I carefully defined it as a first draft, which was not, and could not, be published until Luke was able to expand it by drawing upon Mark. Professor Gilmour also makes a number of very doubtful suggestions. Lk 3^{2b-6}, he holds, is a freely edited version of Mk 1^{2-5}; Lk $3^{19f.}$ is editorial and is based on Mk 6^{17}; Lk $4^{14f.}$ is based on Mk $1^{14b.\ 28.\ 39}$; Lk 4^{16-30} is an expansion of Mk 6^{1-6}; and Lk 19^{41-44} is editorial. In the Passion Narrative, he suggests, additional passages, including Lk $22^{39-44.\ 47-54a}$, $23^{44-46a\ 46c-47}$, and 24^{6b-11}, are drawn from Mark. He concludes his article by saying that, while the Proto-Luke Hypothesis is not necessarily 'a snare and a delusion,' it should be abandoned as 'a brilliant but not convincing vagary of criticism.'[3] Apparently, he is not attracted by the hypothesis!

I should agree that all the points noted above call for renewed examination, and that some of them are important, but I am doubtful if much progress is likely to be made by convenient, but question-begging, allusions to editorial activity on the part of Luke. This argument, derived from older liberal criticism, dies hard. In particular, for those who suggest that Lk 4^{16-30} is Luke's expansion of Mk 6^{1-6}, all things are possible! It is not enough to question the assumption that Luke's method of composition at the beginning and the end of his final work must have been similar to his observable method in the body of it. After all, his observable method is the only evidence we have to work upon, and just reason must be shown for any claim that he departs from it in Lk 3^{1}-4^{30} and Lk 22^{14}-24^{53}. It should be added that Professor Gilmour rightly finds a very considerable element of special tradition in the Passion Narrative, amounting in his list to ninety-

[1] Professor Barr suggests rather doubtful examples in Lk $22^{21.\ 23.\ 33.}$ and more debatable examples in 22^{40-46} and 23^{18-25}. Cf. *The Expository Times*, lv., 230 n.

[2] In his article, 'A Critical Re-examination of Proto-Luke' in the *Journal of Biblical Literature*, lxvii. 143–152.

[3] *Op. cit.*, 152.

four verses [1] out of a hundred and sixty-five. This matter, he says, is Luke's own composition, based on oral tradition in the Church circles in which he moved. I should agree with this judgment, but with the difference that I submit that it is a considerable part of a pre-Markan Passion Narrative which, with other non-Markan passages, formed a continuous account.

III

I have reviewed the main points which have emerged in criticism of the Proto-Luke Hypothesis. I now attempt to summarize them and to indicate what modifications of the hypothesis may be necessary. It is, of course, rare that any hypothesis persists in the form in which it was originally stated, and it is affectation on the part of its promoters to think otherwise. The following conclusions seem justified.

(1) First, the existence of a document Q+L, consisting of a form of Q supplemented by material from Luke's special tradition, at a time earlier than the composition of the Third Gospel, is a reasonable and justifiable assumption. Dr. Hunkin's arguments have much weight in this connexion, and also the recognition of Professor J. M. Creed, and of others, that some form of Proto-Luke may have existed at an early date.

(2) Secondly, the hypothesis of the existence of a Lukan Passion Narrative has much in its favour, and, while modifications in matters of detail may be needed, it does not appear to have been disproved.

(3) Thirdly, increased force has been given to the claim that Lk 21^{20-36} rests on a non-Markan source supplemented by Markan insertions. Whether this material ever belonged to Proto-Luke cannot be determined, but its structure is of great importance in considering the hypothesis as a whole.

(4) Fourthly, it seems not improbable that Mark has been used in Lk $3^{3.16}$, possibly also in some part of Lk 6^{12-19}, and it may be in Lk $22^{39f.\ 46.\ 50-53a}$ and 23^{18-25}, although these points are, and must remain, speculative. I doubt if Streeter was right in suggesting that from Lk 23^{33} to 24^{10a} 'Luke reverses his ordinary procedure and makes Mark his main source.' [2]

It is a temptation for supporters of the hypothesis to want to claim as much as possible for the contents of Proto-Luke, and so to produce a tidy scheme in which Markan and non-Markan elements are precisely differentiated. No serious damage is done to the hypothesis by the admission that, in expanding Proto-Luke, Luke on occasion gave priority to Mark.

(5) Fifthly, the greatest weakness of the hypothesis is a matter not often mentioned in criticism, namely the gap in Proto-Luke before Lk 22^{14}, which has to be explained by the suggestion that the Markan passage Lk 22^{1-13} has replaced what originally stood in that source. Professor Gilmour observes that the 'gap' 'obviously ceases to be a problem once Proto-Luke assumptions are discounted.' [3] I do not think we can settle the matter as easily as this. Such an observation is warranted only when the entire case for the hypothesis has been considered. It is a possible view that the Third Gospel consists of Q+L, a Lukan Passion Narrative, the Birth Stories, and Mark. As at present advised, I prefer to think that the sixfold date in $3^{1f.}$ suggests that the preliminary process of expansion visible in Q+L extended to the Lukan Passion Narrative, and that, in the main, Mark is a second and supplementary source.

In view of the great importance of the Proto-Luke Hypothesis it is the duty of its critics to be constructive as well as critical, just as equally it is not right for its supporters to persist in claims which have been shown to be of doubtful value. I agree with Professor Hunter in the hope he expresses that in the next decade or two we may have a decision one way or the other from scholars 'ready to undertake the linguistic spade-work which such a decision will involve.' [4] So far, as it seems to me, the supporters of the hypothesis have been more constructive than their critics. Both must build if progress is to be made.

[1] These passages include: $22^{14-18.\ 21.\ 23.\ 25-33.\ 36-38.\ 63-65.\ 66-71}$, $23^{1f.\ 4-25.\ 28b-31.\ 39-43.\ 46b}$, $24^{13-35.\ 36-46}$. He says that 22^{19a} and ^{22} show also the use of Mark, that 22^{34} is a Markan addition, and that 23^{3} is 'a Markan insert.' We are well on the way to the recognition of a special Lukan Passion Narrative!

[2] *The Four Gospels*, 217.

[3] *Op. cit.*, 147.

[4] *Op. cit.*, 43.

Contributions and Comments

O. Cullmann's Theory Concerning κωλύειν

O. CULLMANN, in his book *Baptism in the New Testament* (Eng. Tr., 71 f.), argues from the use of the verb κωλύειν in baptismal contexts in Acts, Matthew, and the Gospel of the Ebionites, that in first-century baptismal practice the question whether anything prevented the baptism of this or that candidate became a ritual question. This argument, attractive at first sight, fails on closer inspection to be convincing for the following reasons :

(*a*) The object of κωλύειν differs in the various passages. In Ac 8^{36}, and in the Gospel of the Ebionites (Epiphanius, xxx. 13), and in Mt 3^{14}, where διακωλύειν is used, the object of the verb is the would-be candidate for baptism. In Ac 10^{47} the object is water (τὸ ὕδωρ). In Ac 11^{17} it is God. Such variety does not encourage the belief that we are here in touch with a regular ritual question of a liturgical character. The passage Mk 10^{13-16} and parallels, which Cullmann also adduces, proves nothing as to a baptismal formula, as the passage has nothing whatever to do with baptism. In all these contexts the verb occurs naturally, and is virtually required by the sense of the passages concerned.

(*b*) The verb κωλύειν occurs frequently in the New Testament, twenty-three times in all, twelve times in Luke–Acts. Most of its contexts have no connexion with baptism.

(*c*) The verb occurs very frequently in Greek literature generally, especially in the expressions τί κωλύει (*e.g.*, Plato, *Theaetetus* 143A ; Aristotle, *Ethica Nicomachea*, 1173A 24 ; cf. Ac 8^{36}), and οὐδὲν κωλύει (*e.g.*, Plato, *Euthydemus*, 272D ; *Gorgias*, 458D ; Aristotle, *Ethica Nicomachea*, 1117B 17, 1157A 25). Such expressions would come naturally to any writer in Greek.

(*d*) The verb occurs in the LXX a number of times, on two of them with water as the object, as in Ac 10^{47} (Job 12^{15} ἐὰν κωλύσῃ τὸ ὕδωρ. Ezk 31^{15} ἐκώλυσα πλῆθος ὕδατος). It occurs in Sir 4^{23} μὴ κωλύσῃς λόγον ἐν καιρῷ σωτηρίας. In Nu 11^{28} it is used of forbidding Eldad and Medad : Κύριε Μωυσῆ, κώλυσον αὐτούς (cf. Mk 9^{38-39}, Lk 9^{49-50}). It is used also in Is 43^{6} : ' I will say to the north, Give up ; and to the south, Keep not back (Μὴ κώλυε).' This context is interesting, for it includes references to ' passing through the waters ' (43^{2}) and also to Ethiopia (43^{3} ; cf. Ac 8^{27-38}).

If we must seek a source for Luke's use of the verb κωλύειν, it may be found in Greek usage generally, and LXX usage in particular, rather than in a stereotyped baptismal formula.

A. W. ARGYLE

Regent's Park College,
Oxford

ὡς ἐξουσίαν ἔχων

I SHOULD like to submit the following in reference to the Rev. H. J. Flowers' note in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, lxvi. [May 1955] 254.

Residence in a country where all educated people are bilingual, and even uneducated know a smattering of more than one language (the man who dusts our library books speaks four reasonably fluently), makes me suspicious of those who try to make too much of the Aramaic background of the Gospels. Apart from the presumption of his name it is abundantly clear that Mark knew some Latin, and was quite fluent in Greek, apart from his native Aramaic. The phrase used is Mark's report of the impression Jesus' teaching made on the people, and need not correspond with any particular Aramaic phrase used by them. Assuming further that the main aim of any book is to convey the right impression to those who read, and that Mark's Gospel was first intended for Rome, it might be more appropriate to look for the origin of the phrase in Rome rather than in Palestine. One of the outstanding classical examples of the use of ἐξουσία is in the Greek translation of the *Monumentum Ancyranum*, where it represents the original ' *auctoritas*,' and describes the authority by which Augustus raised his private army after the death of Caesar. The whole point of the word lies in the sharp differentiation from any legal power, since Augustus was then a purely private citizen. After the settlement was achieved Augustus used various legal titles to regularize his position, but the basis of the power of the emperors continued to be the non-legal, personal *auctoritas* (ἐξουσία) which clung to the position. It is true that ἐξουσία in the *Koine* often indicates legal authority or jurisdiction, but it is also true that it can be distinguished, and in this particular contrast, between Jesus and other teachers, it seems much more likely that Mark had in mind a usage which meant so much to the early Empire. Mr. Flowers' derivation from מִמְשָׁל does not go far enough—the authority is not merely that of a king, but of an emperor !

D. F. HUDSON

Serampore,
West Bengal, India

Christ and the Old Testament

By the Reverend J. G. S. S. Thomson, B.D., Ph.D., Edinburgh

Our Lord's love and reverence for, and intimate knowledge of, the Old Testament, which shine so clearly through the Gospel records were shared in varying degrees by many of His Jewish contemporaries, irrespective of whether they lived in Palestine or in the Diaspora.

Just as the Qur'an is the text-book in the Qur'anic schools of Muhammadan North Africa to-day, so the Torah was the text-book of the Synagogue schools in Christ's day. Under the direction and discipline of trained teachers Jewish boys in the schools scattered throughout the towns and country districts of Palestine were trained to memorize and study the Law.

There was also a practical side to this educational system. The pupils were encouraged from a fairly early age to participate in the religious observances which their text-book enjoined. Sabbath observance, the strict fast on the Day of Atonement, participation in the simpler forms of prayer, became part and parcel of religious life as soon as practicable. Then at the age of thirteen a Jewish boy became a Bar Mitzvah, capable of performing his ritual duties, and expected to take part in the Synagogue services when invited to do so.

Now it was in the atmosphere created by this intense application of mind and heart both in the study of the Torah at home and in the Synagogue school, and in the eager and meticulous observance of the Law that our Lord grew up. From His tenderest years He, in common with many of His contemporaries, would be an eager and reverent student of the Old Testament in His simple peasant home and in the Beth Sefer adjoining the Synagogue at Nazareth. His beloved Scriptures would be worked into the warp and woof of His personality. He would early become a Man of the Book, able to recall its words at will, and to apply its ageless truths with an ease and a fluency that come only after years of intense application of mind and heart in the study of its pages.

It appears from the Gospel record that, in the main, our Lord used the Old Testament in two spheres. It was, in the first place, an integral part of His work as Teacher. Here it is sufficient to recall, for example, how completely permeated is the Sermon on the Mount by the Old Testament. How easy it is to find Old Testament parallels to the Beatitudes. That God is Father is central in our Lord's message, but how firmly that concept had seized the minds of some Old Testament writers. And Christ's insistence that the Samaritans and the Gentiles were loved by God as well as the Jews is a reflection of the conviction of Old Testament prophets that in the Kingdom of Messiah Jews and Gentiles would walk together. It is also relevant to suggest that the use of parables in the Old Testament would have some significance for our Lord's own use of metaphor and simile. And how clear was His conviction that many Old Testament prophecies were being fulfilled in His Person and ministry. These observations show that the Old Testament dominated Christ's work as Teacher. It was not merely that the Old Testament coloured His teaching; it was rather integral to His teaching.

In the second place, the Old Testament was indispensable in Jesus' life of devotion and prayer. It was for Him a means of fellowship with His Father. How natural that words from the Old Testament, pondered and prayed over in the solitude, should leap to His mind and become a necessary part of the victory won in the great crises of His life—at His call, in the wilderness Temptation, at the beginning of His ministry, and consistently to the end. Even in death it was with words from Old Testament Scripture that He committed His spirit to the Father.

In this connexion it is worth pointing out that there are in the Gospels hints which suggest that Christ had His favourite passages in the Old Testament. Just as the devout Christian's well-worn Bible betrays not only his love for the whole of Scripture but also a special affection for particular areas of the Word, so it seems that our Lord had a special love for certain Old Testament passages. There was for Him 'an inner canon of Scripture' within the total corpus of Old Testament literature.

This 'inner canon' seems to have included Deuteronomy, Psalms, Isaiah, and Hosea. It was with words from Deuteronomy that Christ emerged victorious from the wilderness; and the summary of the Law which He used is usually Deuteronomic in form. Then, when He summarized His mission (Mt 21^{42}) He used words from the Psalter; and in the agony of the Cross it was words from Ps 22 that came to mind. Again, it was the Book of Isaiah that provided our Lord with the text from which His first sermon was preached. The famous phrase, 'the keys of the kingdom,' probably had its origin in Is 22^{22}.

It is worthy of note, too, that Christ quoted Hos 6^{6} twice. The announcement of His resurrection is also strongly reminiscent of Hos 6^{2}. And

it cannot be coincident that some of His favourite parables are found in germ in Hosea ; those suggested by the wayside flowers (10^4), the work of the farmer (10^{12}), and the fruit of the vine (14^7). Now the significance of these references taken from this ' inner canon of Scripture ' is not in the fact that they occur more than once but that most of them are used in critical moments of our Lord's life and are given a meaningful place in His teaching. The nature of these occasions, and our Lord's manner of teaching, suggest that the words and phrases that leapt spontaneously to His lips had taken a special hold on His mind, and that the passages where they occur had been pondered over with special affection.

The question, What was Christ's attitude to the Old Testament as distinct from His use of it in His personal life and public ministry, is also significant for our subject.

In the first place, we must disabuse our minds of the idea that our Lord set aside the Old Testament *as a whole* as something that was obsolete and outmoded. He came to do something infinitely more difficult than to destroy the Law. His task was to fulfil it but, be it noted, not in the letter but in the spirit. Even the Old Testament itself distinguishes between a meticulous fulfilment of the letter of the Law that was antithetical to the spirit of the Law. Part of the burden of the prophetic message to Israel was an unqualified condemnation of a satisfaction of the Law that was inherently false ; a satisfaction of the externals of the Law that failed to affect the mainsprings of a man's moral life or influence his relations with his neighbour. Now it was obedience to the spirit not the letter of the Old Testament that characterized our Lord's fulfilment of the ancient Scriptures. ' Thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness,' said He to the Baptist.

This insistence on a spiritual not a literal fulfilment of the Old Testament is noticeable even in His handling of Old Testament incidents when preaching. For example, Christ was concerned to reveal the spiritual significance of the experiences of Noah, David, Solomon, Naaman, Jonah, etc., and through these to demonstrate the wider reach of His own mission. It was imperative to show both what the Old Testament writers meant originally and what significance that had for the situation in which the people of His generation found themselves. In so using the Old Testament Jesus was doing two things : He was setting free the Old Testament to resume its original mission and was fulfilling the spirit of the Law.

In the second place, our Lord's attitude to the Old Testament suggests that for Him its revelation was dynamic not static. That the Old Testament revelation had this inherent quality was in the nature of the case inevitable because it was primarily the revelation of a Person—of God Himself. And not only was this revelation dynamic and developing ; it was also preparatory to the fuller revelation of God that Christ mediated to men through His own Person.

Now this view of the Old Testament was significant in three particulars. First, it has significance for Christ's claim that in His Person and mission certain Old Testament prophecies were fulfilled. After reading Is $61^{1ff.}$ as He stood on the threshold of His ministry He solemnly declared to the people in the synagogue at Nazareth : ' To-day hath this scripture been fulfilled in your ears.' Concerning Is 53^{12} He said : ' That which concerneth Me hath fulfilment.' He also saw in His betrayal (Jn 13^{18}), in the world's opposition to Him (Jn 15^{25}), and in His death and resurrection the fulfilment of Old Testament Scripture.

Secondly, the view that the Old Testament revelation was dynamic explains our Lord's insisting that the judgment to be meted out to peoples of an earlier age would be less severe than that which would overtake His contemporaries. The people of Bethsaida, Capernaum, and Chorazin would be more severely dealt with than those of Tyre and Sidon because the former had received more light, a fuller revelation of the redemptive purposes of God. In this was involved heavier responsibilities as well as greater privileges.

This view of the Old Testament explains, thirdly, why Christ felt free to set aside certain precepts of the Law. A more complete revelation of the will and purpose of God made certain Old Testament ordinances obsolete. For example, the time had come to criticize the Mosaic Law on divorce (Mk $10^{2ff.}$). The new concept of sin, namely that defilement came not from without but from the heart, made possible the laying aside of Levitical legislation concerning uncleanness. Liberty regarding Sabbath observance was also possible because ' the Lord of the Sabbath ' had declared that ' the Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath.'

Now this in no way affects our earlier statement that Christ came not to destroy but to fulfil the Law and the Prophets. Here we must distinguish between the civil and ceremonial law on the one hand, and the great moral law on the other. So far as the civil law was concerned no claim was made for its perfection ; and the ceremonial law with its ritual anticipations of redemption through the Cross ran its course and ceased when Christ died. But the moral law which articulates the eternal purposes of God never passes away.

Now these three facts—that in Christ the Old Testament found fulfilment, that He anticipated certain differentia in the judgment of the nations,

and that He felt free to set aside Old Testament statutes and ordinances and place His own personal authority above the teaching of the Law—suggest that for our Lord the Old Testament revelation was dynamic and developing, and was, in virtue of that, incomplete, but that it was to find fulfilment and completion in the perfect revelation of God in His own Person and mission.

But this attitude on the part of our Lord towards the Old Testament and the revelation that it mediates in no way affects the conviction that the ancient Scriptures constituted a supreme authority for life and creed. The Old Testament revelation was incomplete but was nevertheless an integral part of the self-disclosure of God to men and was, therefore, authoritative and authentic. It was an indispensable part of the disclosure of His will and purpose for men.

Now our Lord's attitude to, and use of, the Old Testament is significant for us to-day. It is for us an integral part of the Word of God as it was to Christ. It may be for us, as it was for Him, a support in the crises of life, a means of fellowship with God, an authoritative declaration of God's will for men. And because our Lord fulfilled the Old Testament in His life and mission the New Testament and the Old Testament are for us indissolubly linked together. The New is the consummation of the Old. Instead of speaking disparagingly of the Old Testament we should rather hear one Holy Spirit speaking through both the Old and the New.

In the words of ex-Principal Curtis: 'He [Christ] made it [the Old Testament] the primer of instruction preparatory to His message. . . . To save mankind He saved the Bible of Israel, raising it from the death of literalism, and quickening it with fresh vitality for the whole world. There can be no higher originality than this resurrection power, no revolution more profound.' What higher honour could Christ have paid to the authority of the Old Testament? In what higher way could His authority have authenticated the Old Testament and the revelation that it mediates? 'God hath at the end of these days spoken unto us in His Son.' That is true; but this also is true: 'God of old times spake unto the fathers in the prophets.'

In the Study

Virginibus Puerisque

Making Friends

By the Reverend E. C. Blake, M.R.S.T.,
Welton Vicarage, Lincoln

'In everything by prayer and supplication with thanksgiving let your requests be made known unto God.'—Ph 4^6.

Have you ever thought what is the first thing you must do before you make friends with any one? You must talk to them. Getting into conversation is the first step towards friendship, whether you want to make friends with another boy or girl—or with God. Only when it is God we are talking to we call it praying. I expect you talk to your school friends every day, and God would like you to talk to Him just as often.

But it is not always easy to know what to say to God. I think you will get off to a good start if you begin by praising Him; adoring Him because He is the God who has made you. Then look over the day that has just ended; let it pass in front of your eyes just like a film at the cinema. I am sure you will see things you have done that you are sorry for. Tell God so, and ask Him to forgive you. And while you are looking at this 'film' you will see other things too—things to thank Him for. Perhaps they are only simple things, but we all have much to be thankful for every day.

Other incidents in the film will remind you of people you would like God to care for. Mention them to Him by name, asking Him to bless them. There will be your mother and father, your friends—and your enemies. Last of all you will see from the film the sort of things you ought to ask God for for yourself—help to be better tempered perhaps, or aid in keeping a good resolution going. Ask Him for the help you think you need, but remember you may be wrong and that He knows best, so say, 'Not my will, but thine be done.'

Like a true friend God will always answer when you talk to Him, but He may not always give you the answer you want. It may be 'Yes'; it may be 'No'; it may be 'Wait.' But, whatever the answer, you may be sure that, like a real friend, He wishes you well, and will do all for the best.

These verses will help you to remember how to make friends with God.

O God Who art the children's Friend,
Upon us heavenly blessings send;
That we may know Thee as Thou art,
And worship Thee with loving heart.

We have not done all we should do,
Of naughty things we're guilty too:
Lord we are sorry, we confess,
Father of love, Thy children bless.

We thank Thee, Father, as we should,
For Thou dost send us all things good;
O listen while we sing to Thee
Our thanks, and may they worthy be.

Look down, O Father, from above,
We pray Thee help the ones we love.
May all the people hear Thy call—
O loving Father, bless them all.

Teach us to ask for what is best,
And not to seek for all the rest;
Then when we make our prayers to Thee,
We know that we shall answered be.

With adoration then we'll pray,
Confessing all our sins each day,
We'll thank Thee, and our prayers shall be
For others and ourselves to Thee.

Then Thou wilt be the children's Friend,
And on us heavenly blessings send;
Then we shall know Thee as Thou art,
And worship Thee with loving heart.[1]

Taking Sides

By the Reverend James Wright, M.A.,
Boat of Garten

I know a home where there are two daughters, one Elizabeth aged seven, and one Gillian aged five. Their mother had to leave them alone in the house one day and when she got back she asked Elizabeth how they had got on. 'Oh, Mummy,' replied Elizabeth, 'Gillian was dreadfully naughty—she called me a "Fathead."' 'And what did you say then?' asked her mother. 'I said, you are very wicked, Gillian. When you called me a Fathead, the devil was very pleased with you, but God was very displeased—and do you know what Gillian said then, Mummy, she said "God—oh, He wants everybody on His side."'

And, of course, He does—Gillian was right there. It would not do, I know, if everybody were on the same side all the time. We had a General Election not long ago, and there would be no sense in a General Election if everybody voted the one way. They did that in Hitler's Germany and now they do it in Communist Russia and we don't want that here. Maybe that is a bit deep for you yet, but you will understand this. It would never do if there were only one side in a football match or in a cricket match. There would not be a match without two sides, each trying its hardest against the other, and each with its supporters cheering its own side.

Why, then, should we be all on God's side and none on the devil's side? I'll tell you. If we are all on God's side, then though we take different sides in politics, we don't start hating the other side from ours; and though we try our hardest to beat the opposite side in a game, we don't cheat to win or play unfairly and when the game is done we shake hands and bear no grudge even if we are beaten; and at home if we sometimes disagree with brothers or sisters, we don't, if we are on God's side, fly into a temper against them—and even if they fly into a temper against us, we don't, if Jesus is our Master and we are on His side, fly into a temper against them. It takes two to make a quarrel and we never provide the second.

[1] The verses are by Mr. Blake.—Editor.

The Christian Year

Twenty-first Sunday after Trinity

The Sacredness of Strength

By the Reverend R. Leonard Small, M.A.,
Cramond

'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God . . . with all thy strength.'—Lk 10^{27}.

It has been said of Jesus Christ that everything He touched He transformed, and the Gospels provide ample illustrations of the truth of that saying. He touched children and gave to childhood for ever new dignity, worth and sacredness; He touched the sick and brought wholeness and healing; He touched 'untouchables' like the leper and brought them out of hopelessness into normal living; He 'took bread' and made bread sacramental; He 'took the cup' and transformed the bitterness of every sorrow. In the same way, in this passage, He took the old twofold law of love and imparted to it new depth of meaning. The lawyer's subsequent question evoked that immortal story which makes plain the deeper meaning He gave to the law of love to our neighbour, but did He not also add new depth to the law of love to God? Surely heart, soul, strength and mind, each and all, take on a new worth and dignity, a new sense of sacredness, since He laid upon them His transforming touch, and since He calls us to love God with every power our many-sided personality can possess. That we should love God with all our powers of emotion, spirit and intellect seems a natural and obvious demand, but what of this fourth part of the demand, that almost seems an intrusion among the other three, what of this law: 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy strength'?

Here is a timely and much needed challenge to us in this generation to rediscover the sacredness

of strength, the strength with which Christ bids us love God.

The Christian idea of the sacredness of strength rests in the first instance on the essential 'giveness' of strength, it is never merely an achievement but always a gift of God. That is true of every kind of strength. The Bible itself provides us with the classic example of mere physical strength, 'brute force,' being regarded as a gift of God. Samson may use his phenomenal strength for the most unspiritual of exploits, and his record-breaking efforts of brawn and muscle may be more reminiscent of the White City than the Holy City, but that strength is still God's gift, and when the Lord was departed from him his strength was gone. Perhaps this age that glories in the 'four-minute mile' and can on occasion make a fetish of physical strength and achievements in the world-wide realm of sport, needs to recover this sense of the sacredness of the most obvious kind of strength. Maybe G. K. Chesterton (whom no one could picture as a four-minute miler!) was nearer the mark than some when he voiced a boy's praise to 'God who created me, nimble and light of limb, in three elements free, to run, to ride, to swim.' Strength of that sort, and the much more important strength to do one's daily work, is God's gift, and we forget it at our peril. Amid all the clash of demands for higher pay to be given for the work a man does, and the counter demand that he should do a more honest day's work for the pay he gets already, is it not time to reinstate the old, traditional idea of work, which lent some dignity even to hard times—'Thou dost the strength to workman's arm impart'?

This same thought applies far more widely, to the less obvious forms of strength. Surely the skilled musician's mystic art, the grace of poet's pen or painter's hand are just as much forms of strength in the deep, fundamental sense as the brawn and muscle, however skill-directed, of the workman's arm? Apply this sense of sacredness to all forms of ability, and how wide a field of human effort and achievement will be transformed. If my strength is 'what I can do' then what a call to personal dedication lies in this command to 'love the Lord thy God with all thy strength.' It is no accident that we still look with reverent awe upon the achievements of those centuries in which both the mason and the musician spent his own God-given strength 'to the greater glory of God.' It was in the same spirit that a famous prima donna of only a generation ago sought permission before she retired to sing completely alone in St. Paul's Cathedral, because she, who had sung so often to the crowds and for the crowd, wanted to sing, that once, 'for God alone.' How hard it is in complex modern society for each of us to love and serve God with that which is, for me, 'my strength.'

But there are certain special forms of strength which demand particular consideration in this connexion, because they constitute a special responsibility, and stand in peculiar need of this transforming sense of sacredness. The ideas of strength and power are always associated in our minds, and quite certainly one of the most dangerous kinds of strength is that which gives us power over other people. If a man has great physical strength, let him ever remember, nay let him constantly remind himself, that his normal handshake may crush the hand of lesser mortals. If he is very strong, let him also be very gentle. That is doubly true when you come to that subtler force of personality which gives a man power over others. In a very great phrase in Philippians St. Paul says: 'I can do all things through Christ which strengtheneth me.' 'I can' is the one Greek word '*dunamai*.' Even in this anglicised form the lineage and family connexions of that word are unmistakable. If you are a dynamic personality, if you are a kind of human dynamo issuing energy, if you are one of those who can dynamite their way through obstacles and overthrow opposition, then make very sure that you remember Christ who gives you strength and to whom you are responsible for the use you make of that strength. No one who reads the pages of the Gospels can fail to be impressed with the astonishing and unfailing respect of Jesus Christ for human personality. Resolutely He refused to use the tremendous power of influencing other people which He undoubtedly possessed in order to force others to His way, even when He was completely sure His way was right. Only His deep sense of the sacredness of such strength can keep us as He was, strong yet very gentle.

Yet the most important kind of strength, the most deeply sacred, lies on another level still. It is the rare strength of those favoured few who, possessing all the other gifts already, add to them strength of will and purpose, harnessed to a tremendous sense of vocation. The classic example is Albert Schweitzer. He thus describes his qualifications for the almost superhuman task of training as a doctor, with all his other activities, and going to Africa as a missionary: 'Good health, sound nerves, energy, practical common sense, toughness, prudence, very few wants, and everything else that might be found necessary by anyone wandering along the path of an idea. I believe myself, further, to wear the protective armour of a temperament quite capable of enduring an eventual failure of my plan.' What a description of perfect strength of every sort and

at every level! How much such a man must have with which, in all humility of heart, to love God! How little, by comparison, have we, by way of strength, for this high purpose! Yet the demand is only that we love the Lord with all the strength we happen to have.

TWENTY-SECOND SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

The Communion of Saints

BY THE REVEREND DOUGLAS STEWART, M.A., PINNER

'And I beheld, and I heard the voice of many angels round about the throne and the beasts and the elders: and the number of them was ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands.'—Rev 5^{11}.

'After this I beheld, and, lo, a great multitude, which no man could number, of all nations, and kindreds, and people, and tongues, stood before the throne, and before the Lamb, clothed with white robes, and palms in their hands.'—Rev 7^{9}.

The sense of jubilation which dominates these chapters of the Revelation is in part due to the sheer weight of numbers. We are surveying not only the miracle of the redeemed soul, nor even the wonder of a redeemed community, but something which includes and yet transcends both. St. John the Divine is singing of a redeemed Creation; a work vaster in scale than individual or group, and by its vastness conveying to us in some measure a sense of the immensity of God's purpose and of His glory. Here we have the angels and the elders and the saints and the beasts, 'the multitude, which no man can number, of every nation, and kindred, and people, and tongue,' 'ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands.'

1. Rightly to understand this incursion into mathematics, this compelling of numbers to subserve the higher ends of spiritual vision, and so to minister to a reality beyond the mathematical, has a positive and a negative value for us.

Positively, it enables us to catch a glimpse of the glory of heaven, and to that we shall presently return. Negatively, it helps us to deal with some of the difficulties which beset our human minds whenever we try to think realistically about heaven, and which we must now face. We have suffered in our time from what Geoffrey Hoyland calls 'The Tyranny of Mathematics' so we may be thankful for the Apocalypse which compels mathematics to serve a higher end.

(*a*) The tyranny of mathematics is acutely felt on Remembrance Day when we think of the millions who on this day are commemorated. We each have a private sorrow. And yet that sorrow induces us to meditate on the millions who sorrow with us, and upon the millions who have gone from us beyond the veil of death. Before long we are overwhelmed by the sheer number of the dead as was Dante when he wrote, 'And I saw an ensign . . . and behind it came so long a train of people that I should never have believed death had undone so many.'

And, after all, our commemoration is only of those who were our earthly companions and contemporaries. What of the ages long gone, 'the battles long ago,' 'the silent vanished races'? Death is not a modern discovery: Assyrians, Egyptians, Greeks, Romans have preceded us into the unknown. Death is not an ill fate peculiar to those who fight in battle: the four hundred millions of Chinese, the three hundred and fifty millions of Indians, the Russians, the Americans, all of us are on the march. 'Twenty people die every minute,' said an old grave-digger to me recently. Death is not an experience to be evaded in the future: the millions yet unborn are yet born to die.

And all that is on one little planet which we know. Who can be sure any longer that this planet alone in all the Universe is the seat of life and death? In the depths of space may lie other worlds, other races, over whom 'the last enemy' extends his sway. We are crushed under the weight of numbers. How can there be survival after death? How is eternal life possible for the individual? Where could room be found for all these millions? Heaven, we begin to feel, is only a dream of our childish ignorance. A dream which the waking intelligence rejects. There are far too many in the queue.

(*b*) Before pointing out St. John's answer to that problem it may be worth mentioning another peculiarly modern difficulty which might be called —in distinction from 'the fear of numbers'—'the fear of space.' The modern mind is not only haunted by the crowd, but also by the emptiness of the Universe. Our planet is a speck of dust in the Milky Way. The Milky Way is a nebula composed of dust and stars rotating upon a central axis. It is so vast that sixty thousand years are necessary for light to pass across it, and two hundred million for our sun to complete its orbit within it. And our nebula is but one of millions all equally unimaginable because of their vastness.

This also raises its question. How can God, if there be any God, have a care for anything so small, so utterly unimportant, as the human race? By universal standards our position both in space and time is infinitesimal. How can the life of our race have the slightest significance? Who could possibly believe in the eternal survival of such a creature as man?

(*c*) I have interpolated that second difficulty because it is the antidote to the former. The modern mind can't have it both ways. You cannot in one breath say, 'The number of men on earth, past, present and to come, is so great that no imaginable heaven could contain them,' and in the next breath say, 'The whole race of men relative to the Universe is so utterly insignificant that no Creator could be interested in it.' You cannot have both claustrophobia and agoraphobia when you think of heaven. The one difficulty cancels the other.

2. Our real error, and here St. John corrects us, is relativity. We always think of heaven as it is relative to man. Relative to man heaven may be too vast—as the heavens are too vast. Relative to man heaven may be too crowded so that we are overwhelmed. 'Thou thoughtest that I was altogether such an one as thyself.' We are idolaters who have made God in our own image.

(*a*) 'The heavens declare the glory of God.' We live in a Universe which dwarfs our humanity. It is not man-sized either spacially or temporally. We cannot without idolatry say that it is God-sized, and yet that is nearer to the truth. It is the first word of God. It reveals something of the immensity of His eternal being. These physical heavens overwhelm us but not Him. 'He sendeth out their host by number, for that He is great in power not one faileth.' The imagination of an eternal heaven overwhelms us in the same way. It cannot overwhelm God. These millions are His creation. He is 'the Lord of hosts.' In His Kingdom there is room for all.

There is room for the men of past ages, 'the spirits of just men made perfect.' There is room for the men of the Christian age. 'Their sound is gone out in all lands, and their words to the end of the world.' There is room for Cherubim and Seraphim and the innumerable company of angels. There is room for the lower creation. 'For we know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth together in pain until now waiting for the redemption.' 'And the four beasts said Amen.'

This is a redeemed Creation. Having all the vastness and variety of the Creation we know. 'And I . . . heard the voice of many angels round about the throne and the beasts and the elders: and the number of them was ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands.'

(*b*) In St. John's vision the sense of vastness is balanced by the sense of unity. They all sing one song. What he beholds is not a crowd but a company, the communion of saints.

There is an old saying, 'Heaven for scenery, but hell for company,' which is exactly wrong. There is no 'company' in hell. Every inhabitant is denying the basis of company, of communion, which is the love of God. Hell is centrifugal. Borrowing the image from modern astrophysics, Mr. C. S. Lewis has depicted a hell in which every soul, like the nebulae of our Universe, is flying from every other. How could it be otherwise? The principle of hell is the denial of love.

The principle of heaven is the love of God. All motion is centripetal towards this centre. There is one will, one joy, one song, one desire, which make one company, 'the company of heaven.' Here is something also beyond our imagining. Each soul is individually loved by God.

To-day you remember your loved one in heaven. There he is one of a great company. And yet God knows him more intimately than you do and loves him with a love of which your human love is but the borrowed flame.

TWENTY-THIRD SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

Jacob's Wrestling

BY THE REVEREND T. R. MILFORD, M.A.,
CANON AND CHANCELLOR OF LINCOLN

'I will not let thee go, except thou bless me.'—Gn 32^{26}.

The text is taken from the strange story of Jacob's wrestling at the Ford of Jabbock. . . . Perhaps the wrestling was originally with the spirit of the river, who objected to being crossed; it may be that some piece of primitive folk-lore explaining a taboo has been combined by J with another story explaining the name Israel. However that may be, in the story as we have it, the wrestling is with God, or with His angel. Jacob must know whether the God who has blessed him so far is going to be with him still. But the blessing is given only after a mortal struggle, of which he will bear the marks as long as he lives.

This story, like that of Jacob's Ladder, is prophetic of the destiny of Israel's descendants, the people who above all others were to wrestle with God for His blessing, and in the end prevail.

Moses and the other heroes of the Bible are in many places represented as wrestling with God in prayer and persuading Him to change His mind. The prophets in their intercession stand before God with their people, and only in their struggle to win from Him a blessing, receive His answer, whether of doom or hope.

So throughout the Psalms, there is a constant wrestling with God, an appeal to Him by every sort of consideration, that He would remember His former mercies; that He would not let the heathen triumph, saying, 'Where is now their God?'

In our Lord's own teaching there is recognition of the passionate prayer that goes on and on until it gets its answer. There is the man who wanted to borrow a loaf of bread at night, and went on knocking till he got what he wanted; there is the woman who deaved the unjust judge till he gave her justice. And there is the blessing given to the Syrophenician woman who could not take 'No' for an answer.

Our Lord's own life was the fruit of the age-long wrestling of Israel to secure the fulfilment of the Divine promises and to win peace and salvation for men. His caring for His people was costly and wearing, His healings were not the exertion of an effortless superiority, but were a costing part of the Atonement, so that St. Matthew can apply to them the words of Is 53: 'Himself took our infirmities, and bare our diseases' (Mt 8^{17}). He knew when one had touched His robe that virtue had gone out of Him; and He wept over Jerusalem and at the tomb of Lazarus.

His whole life was lived with a passionate intensity—'I have a baptism to be baptised with; and how am I straitened till it be accomplished.' The strength of the Temptations was just in this, that He was tempted to force the hand of God. And all this led up to the climax of the agony in the Garden, where His sweat was like drops of blood falling to the ground.

The obedience of Jesus is the costly fruit of Israel's long struggle. This people had indeed a zeal for God, but being ignorant of God's righteousness and seeking to establish their own, they did not submit themselves to the righteousness of God. And His obedience does not simply negate the passionate desire of Israel for vindication or justification, but carries it through to the end, where it is fulfilled in the moment of surrender.

The heroes of the Church know this violent wrestling with God in prayer. It begins with St. Paul, bearing about with him the care of all the churches, and having great sorrow and increasing pain in his heart, ready even to wish that he himself were anathema from Christ for his brethren's sake according to the flesh—for the Spirit's own praying in us, he says, is with groanings that cannot be uttered. Heiler calls this 'prophetic prayer' and gives many instances of it, in Luther and others, which as far as outward expression goes are little different from the passionate and even angry prayers of primitive religions, seeking to bend the deity to their will. Heiler contrasts this with the calm acquiescence of 'mystical' prayer,' which is not in the same way characteristic of Biblical religion.

Am I untypical in confessing that I do not much practise this passionate demanding kind of praying, or even this passionate demanding kind of living? We find it more natural to say, too lightly, 'Do what you can, and leave the rest to God; it's not for us to determine the results.' We find it easy, perhaps too easy, to say that the object of Christian prayer is not to get from God what we want, but to conform our wills to His. We pray for sick people without in general minding much whether they get better, or even expecting that our prayer will make much difference. We teach and don't mind much whether what we say is understood. We preach, and don't worry over whether it gets across or not. We ask 'What is truth?' and do not stay for an answer, not, that is, stay till we get one.

All this is wrong; we too lightly get away with it if we do what we conceive to be our duty without worrying about results. We are taking a short cut to the peace of God without being willing to share the Passion. We are anticipating the Sabbath rest of eternity without having worked our six days' stint. God really works, and really cares; and in that last word is the clue.

The scientist knows that Nature's secrets are only revealed to persistent and determined search; he has to take risks with his theory, he has to put it to the test though the result may be that he has to scrap it or recast it. The philosopher knows that headaches and reading and endless re-writing and going through it again and again are necessary in order to get anything clear. The lover and the friend know that unless you take risks with your peace of mind there is no real love and no true friendship. All in their different ways are truly engaged; they wrestle with reality. There is a deep sincerity too in some present-day writers and experimenters with sex; the root sin, they say, is phoniness, pretence, and unreality. Conventional morality, they think, is prudent, kind and barren, and would rather have anything than a scene or any unpleasantness. Christian people, they think, are particularly given to avoiding the issues.

Since God is love, all this is what we should expect. He is love, but the world is not all His; He is the truth, and yet we do not know Him; He is the peace which still we have not found; He is eternal life, and still we are content to live like the beasts that perish. And so His spirit in the creatures makes them strive and struggle and agonise. His spirit in us makes us love one another, love our families and neighbours and friends and really mind what happens to them. His spirit in us, when one of our own children is sick or in danger, keeps us awake and makes us wrestle with care and perhaps with prayer and ring up the doctor and fly home from the ends of the earth; and it is only through that caring

that we can come to the point of knowing that He loves our children more than we do, and that in Him alone is our trust. And when it is other people's children, or the folk next door, or the African with a strangulated hernia on the edge of the primeval forest, the calmness of our prayer and the littleness of our concern is not the measure of our faith, but of our little love. We have no right to peace of mind in the world as it is, unless we have been tempted to worry ourselves to death and to worry God with our prayers and our friends with our concern, and at the far side of that have been given the blessing of His peace.

Since God is truth and we do not effectively know Him, we cannot settle down in a dogmatic slumber and call it faith. It is His spirit that bids nor sit nor stand, but go. It is His spirit which makes us ask the awkward questions beginning 'Yes, but . . .' 'Our interest's on the dangerous edge of things,' as Bishop Blougram said, and we shall never get them safely tidied up until that day when we know even as we are known.

Our wrestling is not really against God, though in the process it feels like it quite often. It was God's own spirit which was leading Jacob home, and he wrestled against something which was not God, but neither was it flesh and blood, nor merely his own lower nature. Perhaps there was truth after all in that most primitive form of the myth which saw him opposed by the spirit of the neighbourhood, by something in the recalcitrant nature of things, which also is God's creation, but not yet wholly obedient to His will. And our wrestling is against principalities and powers, and the world rulers of this darkness, against the forces and trends and tendencies which have mankind in their grip, against ignorances and prejudices and hasty dogmatisms and premature answers; against indifference and despair, and all the easy speeches which comfort cruel men. These things are bogies, mostly unreal, and when bravely faced they fade and vanish in the light of determined criticism. We wrestle also with the facts of Nature and the obstinacy and indifference of things; these suddenly and often graciously yield up their secret if we persist enough.

Our wrestling is not really against God, but it is only through our faithful wrestling with these other things which mediate and conceal His presence that we can attain the blessing which He has in store for those who persevere.

'I will not let thee go, except thou bless me'; but when the day breaks, and I see Thee no longer as in a glass darkly, but face to face, then I shall know that in Truth it was Thy love that would not let *me* go.

SUNDAY NEXT BEFORE ADVENT

The Statutes Turned into Songs

BY THE LATE PROFESSOR D. M. BAILLIE, D.D., OF ST. ANDREWS [1]

'Thy statutes have been my songs in the house of my pilgrimage.'—Ps 119[54].

That great Scottish patriot Fletcher of Saltoun said: 'Let me make the songs of a country, and let who will make its laws.' But this ancient Hebrew Psalmist says something better still. He says that for him the laws have become songs, to inspire him on his way through life. As Dr. Moffatt translates it: 'Thy statutes are my songs, as I wander through the world.' In fact, though the Psalmist lived long before the dawn of the gospel of Christ, he had travelled a long way towards it—you might say he had already got half-way between the law and the gospel. To him the good life was no longer a mere commandment, to be kept with a weary and grudging effort. No, he had entered so much into the spirit of it that it was more like a bit of music.

In his charming book *In Search of England* H. V. Morton tells us of an experience he had in Winchester Cathedral. He was up in the tower, among the bells, with a party of visitors under the guidance of the verger—a mixed crowd, he says. The verger numbered them all, gave each of them a bell-rope, and then pointed to each in turn as he wished them to ring their bell; and so he drew forth from that unpromising assembly the tune of 'Abide with Me.' Morton says: 'We were delighted with ourselves.' But of course it wasn't music. They all did what they were told, but you can't get music by commandment.

By way of contrast, think of a group of men and women united in a good orchestra, engaged in a Beethoven symphony. Again each individual has his own instrument, and again they all take their directions from one man who is conductor. But what a contrast between the two ideas, and between the two results! In the orchestra there is nothing mechanical. Everyone has a grasp of the music, everyone is loyal to the conductor, everyone has entered into the spirit of the symphony, and takes delight in contributing his part, with understanding and with enthusiasm. The symphony carries them on, lifts them all above themselves into a kind of supernatural achievement. That is music. That is the real thing.

[1] From Professor Baillie's unpublished sermons we have selected a small number and these will appear in consecutive months.—Editor.

What a good parable of the real Christian life! The real Christian life is not mere morality, a matter of always 'toeing the line,' and then being 'delighted with yourself,' like those stodgy people in the tower of Winchester Cathedral who pulled a bell-rope when they were told. There wasn't a breath of the spirit of music there. And the Christian life ought to make music. 'Thy statutes have been my songs in the house of my pilgrimage.'

What a difference it makes when we have that really Christian attitude. We shall take two different departments of conduct as illustrations.

(1) Take that problem of *Sunday observance*. On this question one often finds people divided sharply into two opposite camps—the strict Sabbatarians on the one side and the Libertarians on the other. And very often both parties are on a false trail, and fundamentally they are making the same mistake—both are looking at it in a too legal spirit, as if it were a matter of law, while it is really a matter of gospel. They have not learned to turn the statute into a song.

Strict Sabbatarians sometimes speak as if we had nothing to do but quote an ancient Hebrew law from the Old Testament. 'Remember the sabbath day to keep it holy,' and they take it simply to mean that on a certain day every week you must never do anything you can avoid doing. What a poor negative uninspired way of looking at it! Jesus had no use for that kind of thing—it is quite plain from the gospel story. He said 'The sabbath was made for man, and not man for the sabbath,' and that meant a quite different way of looking at it. And as for His disciples, when a little later they began to keep the Lord's Day (which is what we now keep, as Christians), well, that wasn't the Sabbath at all, but something much better. It wasn't the last day of the week, but the first; and it was a day on which you do certain things—splendid, joyful things, acts of worship and fellowship, lifting you above the work-a-day world, because it is the Lord's Day, the day when Christians remember the victory of Jesus Christ. There is no definite Christian law as to what you may do and what you must not do on Sunday—it is something far better than a law. Sabbatarians need to remember that.

But then the Libertarians need it just as much. For they are apt to make just the same mistake. They treat it as a matter of law. They say: Prove to me that it is wrong to do such and such a thing on Sunday, and if you can't, then I'll begin doing it. They ask: 'Is there any harm in playing games on Sunday?' As if that were ever a healthy kind of criterion for a Christian. The Christian is pledged to aim at the very highest and to make the very best of every gift. Therefore the question for a virile Christian is: What is the very best kind of use that we as individuals and as a community or as a nation can make of this one day in seven which by long tradition has been kept free from the ordinary work of the world? If we could all come to look at the questions as eager, responsible Christians, one result would be that we would be far less ready to criticize others for things they do on Sunday; and another would be that we would make a far better use of Sunday ourselves. 'Thy statutes have become my songs'—that's what's wanted.

(2) Again, let us apply the same principle to the question of *moral purity*. Here, again, people often think of it as if it were merely a mysterious law, arbitrarily laid down by God, that we mustn't do certain things. People say, as it were: 'These animal instincts that I feel in me are somehow wrong and wicked because God has chosen to call them wicked; but I don't know why. And if they are wicked, I don't know why they are in human nature at all. But I suppose I must just toe the line, and suppress them and live a pure life.' But what a sad, weary way to look at the matter—as if God had given us nothing more than the Seventh Commandment. When people take it in that way, they don't usually make a very good job of it. They don't attain a very inward kind of purity, and if they do manage half against their wills to maintain an outward standard of purity, in a grudging spirit, they usually become very uncharitable towards those who have fallen.

If we're going to be Christians we must learn a far better secret of purity than that. For one thing, we must learn that those instincts and appetites are not wrong in themselves. But, for another thing, we must learn that they can make awful havoc of human life unless we use them as God meant us to use them. But there is a third thing we have to learn: that the laws of purity can't be kept by a mere dull negative effort, in the spirit of a galley-slave under a slave-driver. To quote a famous saying (from Sir John Seeley): 'No heart is pure that is not passionate; no virtue is safe that is not enthusiastic.' The only way to save the soul from lust is to get the heart filled with love—the love of God and man, the noble enthusiasm of the Christian life. That is something big enough to catch up and use and ennoble and glorify every instinct and appetite and that is what is really meant by Christian purity.

Don't try to make the Christian life a poor, dull, negative business. It is a matter of hearing the voice of Jesus and, like the disciples by the Lake of Galilee, rising up wholeheartedly to follow Him, with a new enthusiasm and a new treasure which can make music in our hearts, and make our lives

to run on like music; so that we are lifted above our temptations, and His statutes become our songs.

But there is one thing more to be said. That happy result does not happen completely all at once. It does not happen completely in this earthly life at all. Because, after all, this earthly life is 'the house of our pilgrimage' and not our ultimate home. Sometimes we don't want to do God's will. It is bound to be so during the period of our pilgrimage. That is why the statute is needed like a hedge to fence in our path. But the longer we go on in the path of our pilgrimage, the more does the statute turn into a song, and we march on to its music—we 'run in the way of his commandments,' because God with His love has 'enlarged our hearts.'

The Days of the Son of Man

(Luke xvii. 22)

By the Reverend Robert Leaney, M.A., B.D., Vice-Principal, Ripon Hall, Oxford

Luke 17^{22}, 'He said to the disciples, "The days will come when you will long to see one of the days of the Son of man and you will not see one. . . ."', is a verse for which no satisfactory explanation has been given. Dodd, in a footnote on p. 83 of *The Parables of the Kingdom*, remarks that 'The Day of the Son of Man' corresponds to the Old Testament expression, 'The Day of Jehovah,' and that the term underlying Lk 17^{24} and 17^{26} as well as Matthew's ἡ παρουσία τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου is 'The Day of the Son of Man'; but it must be admitted that the actual phrase does not appear in the Gospels. Manson (*The Sayings of Jesus*, 142) also compares 'the day of the Son of Man' with 'the day of the Lord' in the Old Testament, and thinks that 'strictly speaking, therefore, it is not proper to speak of "the days of the Son of Man."' He cites therefore with approval the suggestion by Torrey, *The Four Gospels*, 312: 'The present text depends on a misunderstanding of the Aramaic adverb *lachda* meaning "very much" as the numeral "one" with the sign of the accusative. The true meaning is then "you will greatly desire to see the day of the Son of Man."'

This kind of explanation not only assumes a mistake on the part of Luke in translating Aramaic, but a mistake of the kind which allowed him to use a phrase which is 'strictly speaking, not proper,' as though Luke had no eschatology of his own in which such a phrase must either mean something of importance or else be an isolated puzzle in an otherwise coherent scheme. But Luke has a coherent eschatology, and the purpose of this note is to suggest that the true interpretation is that Luke contemplated not one but a number of appearances of the Lord. The passage which follows warns first against being deceived by apparent signs, for in His day the Son of man will shine like lightning (17^{24}). This ἀστραπὴ ἀστράπτουσα is reminiscent of the description which Luke gives of the transfigured Lord (9^{29}) in place of the Marcan phrases (Mk 9^{3}), Luke there writing ὁ ἱματισμὸς αὐτοῦ λευκὸς ἐξαστράπτων. It is the δόξα which shone round the shepherds at the Nativity (2^{9}), which was also to blind Paul on the road to Damascus (Ac 9^{3} 22^{11} 26^{13}). It is true that Luke in this verse, 17^{24}, writes the singular, according to the received version ('in his day') but in *v.* 26 he writes '. . . and as it was in the days of Noah, so will it be in the days of the Son of man,' and it is to be noted that the omission of ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ αὐτοῦ in *v.* 24 by so many authorities as B D e a b c i and the Sahidic is not necessarily due to *homoioteleuton* after ἀνθρώπου. The omission makes excellent sense and it may be that these authorities preserve the original, so easily assimilated to later interpretations, Matthew writing in his parallel passage (24^{37}) '. . . so will be the parousia of the Son of man,' as also at 24^{27} and 24^{39}. These later interpretations may indeed be nearer the intention of the original which Luke is using here (it is a 'Q' passage) but there is reason to believe that Luke has stamped his own form of eschatology on the material itself envisaging only one day of the Son of Man, and that this was the original implication of $17^{30\text{-}37}$; but just as at 21^{20} he turns the cryptic Mk 13^{14} into a prophecy of the siege of Jerusalem, so in 17^{30} he turns 'so will it be on the day of the Son of man' into 'so will it be on the day when the Son of man is revealed,' apparently referring to the same event as is prophesied at 21^{27}, which in Luke presages the deliverance of God's people after the destruction of Jerusalem by the Gentiles, not the final Judgment, as is clear from his pointed omission of Mk 13^{27} and his substitution of 21^{28}, which is peculiar to Luke; it is this same destruction of Jerusalem which Luke makes $17^{30\text{-}37}$ describe, giving to *v.* 37 a significance which the parallel Mt 24^{28} (appearing in the context of Mk 13) is far from possessing.

What other days are ' Days of the Son of Man ' ? For Luke, certainly the Transfiguration : it is one of the days of the Son of Man such as the disciples in the grim days ahead will long to see. Another is prophesied as the presage of the Kingdom. Another of course is the final appearance ; and in addition to these, both Stephen and Paul experienced such a day, and Lk 17^{22} shows that Luke thinks of Jesus as foreseeing these in the time of His earthly ministry. Can we add even more to these instances ? If not without hesitation, yet there remains an obvious passage which illustrates several of the points which we have mentioned. This is Ac 1^{11}. The condensed style would preclude any description of glory in *v.* 3, but it is probably right to regard the ' forty days ' as in any case falling outside the category of an appearance in glory, because Christ has not yet been exalted.

If not yet exalted, Jesus at this time speaks of matters connected with the Kingdom of God, and after promising the disciples that they will receive power to be His witnesses, ' a cloud received him out of their sight,' surely the same cloud which enshrined His glory at the Transfiguration. There is another link between the Transfiguration and the Ascension, connecting both with the Resurrection : this link is provided by the ' two men ' ' in shining apparel ' (24^4) where the word translated ' shining ' is ἀστραπτούσῃ. Before this, at the Transfiguration, ' two men were talking to him, who were Moses and Elijah,' (9^{30}). This rather odd way of identifying the two figures is explained when we recognize that Luke is claiming that the source of the women's information and fright at the tomb was not a young man (Mk 16^4) nor an angel (Mt $28^{2ff.}$) but Moses and Elijah, linked at all their occurrences by his καὶ ἰδοὺ δύο ἄνδρες (or ἄνδρες δύο) (9^{30} 24^4, Ac 1^{10}) but identified only at Lk 9^{30}, where indeed the Marcan tradition made it obligatory. This identification is the more natural in that Moses and Elijah speak at the Transfiguration of the ἔξοδος which Jesus was to fulfil at Jerusalem : they therefore themselves reappear at the two trumphant and decisive stages of that ἔξοδος.

The Transfiguration is unique in being a day of the Son of Man occurring before He has entered into His glory, and it is significant that Luke links it so closely with a prophecy of the suffering by which He will enter into it. The Resurrection and Ascension may be regarded as days of the entering into glory, while Peter at Ac 3^{19-21} looks forward to days when the words of the ' two men ' at the Ascension will be fulfilled, but in the meantime heaven must receive the Lord until the times of the restoration of all, the noun ' restoration ' being derived from the verb for ' restore ' in the apostles' question in Ac 1^6, and in the meantime repentance will bring ' seasons of refreshment from the presence of the Lord.' This restoration of all cannot refer to the Parousia : the phrase would hardly suit a scene imagined to be one of judgment of all and the destruction of some ; Peter is addressing the λαός (3^{12}) and insists that to them first the offer of Blessing—consequent on turning from their wickedness—is made (3^{25-26}). He is looking forward to the restoration of Israel, to the same event about which, according to Luke, the Lord prophecies in Lk 21^{27}. If then, Luke intended by ' Days of the Son of Man ' a number of glorious days, we can at least show that both the Gospel and Acts give us a list of them—the Transfiguration, the Resurrection and Ascension taken together, the appearance to Stephen and Paul, the restoration of Jerusalem and Israel, and the final consummation.

Recent Foreign Theology

The Sources of Kings. Professor A. Jepsen, of Greifswald, has published an original study of the sources of the Books of Kings.[1] He distinguishes a synchronistic chronicle and a book of annals of the kings of Israel and Judah. These received the attention of three successive editors, the first early in the exilic period, the second a deuteronomistic editor who was a Benjamite and who worked in Palestine during the exile, and the third a Levite who introduced slight changes at the end of the sixth chapter. The closing section of the book deals with the form and character of Israelite historiography as found in Kings, and it argues that running through all the sources we find a quality which is peculiarly Israelite because it is based on the sense of the divine revelation granted to Israel.

[1] *Die Quellen des Kōnigsbuches* [1953]. Niemeyer, Halle ; DM. 12.30.

Faith and History. In the Swiss series of Theological studies, Bibliothèque Théologique, a French translation of Reinhold Niebuhr's *Faith and History* has been published.[2] As the English edition of this work was reviewed in The Expository Times in February 1950,[3] it is unnecessary here to do more than note this. The translator,

[2] *Foi et Histoire* [1953]. Delachaux & Niestlé, Neuchatel.

[3] Vol. lxi. 137 f.

Marcel J. Brun, has added an Introduction of eight pages, in which he offers a short account of the life and work of Niebuhr.

The Journeys of St. Paul. In the Swiss series of Cahiers d'Archéologie Biblique, of which the first three volumes have been from the pen of André Parrot, a fourth volume has now appeared, from the pen of Henri Metzger.[1] This is a well-illustrated study of the routes followed by the Apostle Paul on his missionary journeys, and on his voyage to Rome. Like all the volumes of this series, it is a simple account for wide circulation, and there are no learned discussions of all the questions involved. For instance, the North Galatian theory is here accepted without argument, as against the South Galatian theory which was persuasively presented by Ramsay and long accepted by many, but which now appears to be suffering a decline. These little books must be a boon to teachers who use the French language.

The New Year Festival in Israel. For thirty years the name of Professor Mowinckel has been associated with the view that many of the Psalms were associated with the annual New Year Festival in Israel, which was of the nature of an Accession Festival similar to the Babylonian festival. He has now published an important, but slender, volume, offering his replies to some criticisms which have been launched against him. Its title is *Concerning the Israelite New Year and the Meaning of the Accession Psalms*.[2] It deals in particular with two of his critics, Sverre Aalen and N. H. Snaith. The former had argued that the turn of the year plays little part in the Old Testament, whereas the thought of day and night, or morning and evening, plays a much larger part. In the first part of his book, therefore, Mowinckel examines the Old Testament evidence on the character of the year and the significance of its beginning, and maintains that Aalen's attack fails. Snaith, on the other hand, argued that the so-called Accession Psalms were really Sabbath psalms. Hence in the second part of his book Mowinckel defends his thesis against this assault. The character and use of the Psalms is still one of the most debated issues in the Old Testament, since the evidence is less specific than we could wish; but it seems likely that many were used to accompany the royal acts in the New Year ritual, though how far this was comparable with the Babylonian ritual is more doubtful.

Kingship in Israel. One of the keenly debated issues in modern Old Testament scholarship centres in the character of the kingship in Israel. The views of what is often referred to as the 'Myth and Ritual' school, whose founder and high priest is Professor S. H. Hooke, have been taken up and developed by the 'Uppsala school.' In its more extreme forms this has given rise to talk of 'divine kingship' in Israel. Father J. de Fraine has now published a large volume, under the title *The Religious Aspect of the Israelite Kingship*,[3] examining the relations between Mesopotamian and Israelite kingship, and attacking the positions of what he calls the 'Anglo-Scandinavian' school. Both in England and in Scandinavia the phrase 'divine kingship' has given place to the expression 'sacral kingship,' and in part Father de Fraine is flogging a dead horse. His work is of considerable value and importance, however, because of its very rich documentation, and because of its survey of a wide literature dealing with various aspects of 'patternism.' While the reviewer has always been cautious in his attitude to patternism, he feels that de Fraine's rejection of it is too complete. He rebukes the reviewer for saying that evidence from the Psalter indicating that the king played a part in the ritual usage of Israel is not easily dismissed, but it is probable that when Professor A. R. Johnson's Haskell Lectures are published, in the near future, this will be widely recognized. Occasionally, de Fraine is not quite fair to his opponents. On p. 334 he dismisses as gratuitous Professor Johnson's 'unblushing' assumption that in Ps 118[5] the king is the spokesman, but on p. 389 he makes the same 'unblushing' assumption for *v.* 10 of this psalm. The inconsistency is concealed from his reader, and perhaps from himself, by the fact that he gives the psalm its Vulgate number in one place and its Hebrew number in the other. In all further discussion of the questions involved de Fraine's book will play an important part, and every reader will thank him for the immense amount of labour which has gone into its preparation.

The Jerusalem Bible. With the publication of three more volumes the Jerusalem Bible, published under the direction of the Dominican Fathers of the École Biblique, is now complete. The almost incredible speed at which it has appeared in about

[1] *Les Routes de St. Paul* [1954]. Delachaux & Niestlé, Neuchatel; Swiss Fr. 4.

[2] *Zum israelitischen Neujahr und zur Deutung der Thronbesteigungspsalmen* [1953] (date on title page is 1952, but the work is stated to have been printed in June, 1953). Dybwad, Oslo; Kr. 6.

[3] *L'Aspect religieux de la Royauté Israélite : l'Institution monarchique dans l'Ancien Testament et dans les Textes Mésopotamiens* (Analecta Biblica, No. 3), [1954]. Pontificio Instituto Biblico, Rome; Lire 5000.

seven years is matched by the excellence of the achievement. The commentary is very brief, since the new translation is the main purpose of the edition. Yet each volume contains a short Introduction, textual and exegetical notes, in which is compressed a surprising amount of information. The latest volumes are on Chronicles, Daniel and the Epistles to the Thessalonians. That on Chronicles is by Dr. H. Cazelles,[1] who attributes the work to an author in the Greek period, himself a Levite of the outlook that developed into Pharisaism, and basing himself on older sources, but revealing throughout his own theological interests. The theory of two redactions by authors of different date or outlook is rejected, and the common somewhat negative valuation of the Chronicler as a historian is here replaced by a more positive estimate of him as a religious teacher. The commentary on Daniel is by Father P.-J. de Menasce,[2] and it is marked by a thoroughly scholarly outlook. The historical difficulties are tactfully recognized, and the work is attributed to the Maccabaean age, with the climax of the visions in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes. The four kingdoms of ch. 7 are identified with the Neo-Babylonian, the Median, the Persian, and the Greek kingdoms. There is a good section of the Introduction on the ideas of the book, and their links with Persian thought and with the apocalyptic works of the inter-testamental period are fully recognized. The commentary deals with the apocryphal parts as well as with the Hebrew book of Daniel. The volume on the Epistles to the Thessalonians is by Fathers L.-M. Dewailly and B. Rigaux,[3] who accept the genuineness of both Epistles and who believe both were addressed to the same communities. A long and valuable section of the Introduction is devoted to the teaching of the Epistles. The warmth of the welcome accorded to the volumes of this commentary in France is symptomatic of the growing interest in Biblical study in Roman Catholic circles, and of the readiness to make known, in a work designed for wide circulation, the fruits of modern critical scholarship.

H. H. Rowley

Manchester University

[1] *Les Livres des Chroniques.* Fr. 675. All these three volumes bear the date 1954, and issue from Les Éditions du Cerf, Paris.

[2] *Daniel.* Fr. 285.

[3] *Les Épitres de Saint Paul aux Thessaloniciens.* Fr. 210.

Entre Nous

Professor Donald Baillie's Sermons

It is given to very few men to acquire and to deserve a threefold reputation for greatness in one life-time ; but that is what Donald Baillie of St. Andrews achieved. The whole world knew him as a scholar and a theologian of the first rank. The whole Church knew him as a preacher of power and illumination. And those who knew him and loved him personally would not hesitate to call him a saint of God. For that reason we approach his posthumous book of sermons, *To Whom Shall We Go?* (Saint Andrew Press ; 15s. net), with special expectation and we are not disappointed.

The book has three sections—Sermons preached in St. Andrews University Chapel, A Series of Sermons for Lent and Easter-tide, and Sermons on Various Occasions. Every one of these sermons deals with the great central verities of the Christian faith. Every one of them has the lucidity of order which comes from the mind of the born teacher. And every one of them has that deceptive simplicity which is the outcome of fullness of knowlege and mastery of the subject.

As an example we take the sermon on Jn $20^{30f.}$ in which Dr. Baillie dealt with the reason why the Gospels were written. (1) They were written to supply a sketch of the life of Jesus. But ' they were not meant for a dictionary of biography, they were not intended for the reference department of a public library ; they were written because they were required by the Church for the work of spreading and handing down the Christian faith.' They were written because, without the telling of the story, the meaning of Christianity could not be expressed at all. That is important because it is the proof that ' The Christian Message is fundamentally a story.' It is not a system of general timeless truths ; it is not the essence which is squeezed out when the pulp of history is left behind. It is the life of a man called Jesus. (2) But the Gospels were also written that we might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God. The gospel story is not merely a biography ; it is a story with a plot, a divine and superhuman plot. The fact that Jesus is called Messiah is not irrelevant ; for the fact that there was a Messiah and that that Messiah came is the proof that there

is purpose in history. The story begins in eternity, dips into time, and ends in eternity. And that very fact is the proof that history is not purposeless, but purposeful. (3) The gospel story is not only biography, it is not only the clue to history; it is essentially the good news. It is the offer of life to men who were and are seeking for life.

There is a special loveliness in the sermons preached in St. Andrews University Chapel. These sermons are like the words of a wise father speaking to his children in the faith. There are many books of sermons which are good but ephemeral; they have their day and they cease to be. But we are sure that this book of sermons will be a permanent addition to that select number of books of sermons which will last as long as preaching lasts.

The book has been well edited by Mrs. Donalda Dow and its value is enhanced by a lovely introductory memoir by Dr. John Dow.

WILLIAM BARCLAY

The House Filled with Smoke

The Principal of Aberdeen University, Sir Thomas Murray Taylor, preached a memorable sermon in St. Giles' Cathedral in October 1951. This has now been published by the Saint Andrew Press (1s. 6d. net). His subject was the sense of mystery 'which is the condition precedent of religious belief and which, as I believe, can never in the nature of things be finally dispelled by any advance in human knowledge, however extensive.' The text was the last words of Isaiah 6[4] 'and the house was filled with smoke.' 'I take them,' he said, 'to express the profound sense of mystery and awe which the writer felt in the presence of God and which indeed attaches also to the existence of man and the world in which he lives.'

The Way of Committal

'There is no realm in which the paradoxical character of human existence is more evident than in the attainment of significance and integration in our own personal lives. There is at one stage of life—for some types at least—a certain attractiveness in feeling free and unattached. . . . This idea is found in Francis Bacon's prescription for happiness not to commit one's self too peremptorily to anything but always to have a window whereby to fly out. . . . But for all who are tempted to take this course the warning stands: he that saveth his life shall lose it. That kind of life does not look so good at thirty as it did at twenty, and at forty it leads to a tragic sense that somehow everything has been missed and it is now too late to find it. From this rootless and unattached existence most people are rescued by love and marriage, or by absorption in some worthy cause which transcends the narrow circle of their own self-interest and to which they can give themselves. It is then that they attain to a sense of significance and belonging, precisely because now there is no window left whereby to fly out. It is this committal which gives you the stature of adult human beings and it is not a matter of logical or scientific proof but of personal decision. And if this is true of personal human relations it is no less true of our relations to the universe itself. Here too there is no way of feeling at home in it except the way of committal. Here too fulfilment and significance are to be sought not in any illusions of independence or defiance but in a surrender to the Love that moves the sun and all the stars, in whose service we find perfect freedom.'[1]

Hard to be a Christian

In the June *Modern Churchman* there is a reference to the statement made by the Reverend Hugh Martin in the *Daily Mail* of 19th May. In it Mr. Martin cited the case of Aldous Huxley. 'At one time a bitter opponent of Christian morality and Christian belief he makes a very significant admission in his "Ends and Means." He tells us that his conviction that the world has no meaning was not only due to intellectual difficulties. "I had motives for not wanting the world to have a meaning: consequently, assuming that it had none, I was able without any difficulty to find satisfying reasons for this assumption."'

S.O.T.S. Book List

This year's Book List of the Society for Old Testament Study, edited by Professor H. H. Rowley, contains in its seventy-nine pages short reviews of nearly two hundred publications in ten or a dozen languages, including Czech and Afrikaans, over the initials of thirty-three contributors. The List is in demand all over the world and any one who would like a copy should apply without too much delay to Mr. D. R. Ap-Thomas, Llansadwrn, Menai Bridge, Anglesey. The price is 6s. or $1.00 post free.

[1] *The House Filled with Smoke*, 17 ff.

Printed in Scotland by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.